

Volume VI.

JULY, 1907.

Number 3.

The South Atlantic Quarterly.

The High School and the University*

BY JAMES H. KIRKLAND,

Chancellor of Vanderbilt University

My subject has reference to colleges rather than to universities. I shall have nothing to say with regard to professional work or even to graduate work that may be carried on by universities, but am concerned only with the work done by them in the college department. It is my purpose to consider the work of school and college in their mutual relationship. It is agreed that this relationship is very close, that these institutions are not independent educational forces, but must be considered as engaged in one common work. As a matter of fact, a certain degree of unity runs through the whole educational process from the kindergarten to the university. It does not follow, however, that this educational development is at all stages subject to the same laws or that it can be carried on under identical conditions. On the contrary, experience has shown that this work must be divided into different stages separate from each other and differing entirely in method and environment if not in purpose. The kindergarten is one institution, the grammar school another, the high school another, the college another, and the university still another.

Our whole discussion centers around two questions which serve to outline the purpose and extent of this paper. First, where is the proper line of demarcation between high school and college work? Second, by what character of institution shall high school work be done?

It would seem that the answer to these questions ought not to be difficult. General educational theory has established an ortho-

*An address delivered at the Conference for Education in the South, Pinehurst, N. C., April 10, 1907.

dox answer to both of them. But if we confine our attention chiefly to Southern institutions we shall see that these institutions in practice do not answer these questions alike nor do they generally answer them in accord with accepted educational theory. For a score of years I have felt that one of the most important tasks before Southern educational leaders is to secure a correct answer to these questions, given not on paper, but worked out in the life of our institutions. In my opinion successful educational work depends on the acceptance of the best theories of work that are current today. We must live each day in the light of the opportunities and responsibilities which that day brings. We may not govern ourselves or excuse ourselves by standards that were in vogue at other times and in other places. A Greek citizen may have been well educated through the study of geometry and philosophy, but our modern university curriculum must include more than these. A century ago Harvard graduated students at eighteen, but to do so today would forfeit the place of leadership this great institution has worthily won. Fifty years ago chemistry was universally taught without a laboratory, but if we should do so today we should be guilty of educational sham. In a word, the experience of the world establishes for each generation certain educational standards and principles, and no institution can safely be allowed to deviate too widely from these. Without meaning to develop all institutions alike or to hold all to a procrustean measurement, it remains true that all institutions must alike hold sacred the accepted theories of work and life. To sum up the question in one illustration,—may we regard it as a legitimate performance for an institution calling itself a university to give a high school course, dignify it with the name of a university course, and reward it with the degree of Bachelor of Arts? We assume that the work done is well done and honestly done. The question we are raising concerns itself with the right of an institution to call by one name that which the world insists on calling by another name. We maintain that an institution has no such right, that to give such a course as above suggested is to sin against light and opportunity, to evade responsibility, to tear down intellectual life, and to inculcate false ideas and ideals. The growth of educational standards, like the growth of social and ethical standards, is under the control of

no absolute law, but society must conform to the demands of the day. Slavery today would be a very different proposition from slavery one hundred years ago, both socially and ethically. An appeal for sound standards in education is not a mere question of educational theory, as, for example, the question of classics against the sciences, or the number of baccalaureate degrees that should be given. We should rather say that an appeal for sound standards is an appeal for right living and right thinking, an appeal for truth, an appeal for progress. Holding as I do these views, I do not hesitate to answer my own questions and to say that the line of demarcation between the high schools and the college should be the completion of the high school course and that colleges ought not to admit students until this course is completed. By the high school course I mean the full course of four years, although I realize that even this does not describe exactly the amount of attainments. It is, however, accurate enough for the establishment of a legitimate point of beginning for the college.

In the second place I maintain that this work should be done in high schools, whether public or private, and that these schools should be organized and equipped for this especial purpose; especially do I claim that this work should not be done either by colleges or universities or any other institutions where it is conducted under a name designed to dignify unduly the character of the work.

Let us now see how this theory accords with educational practice in the South. We shall find that high school work is being done by three classes of institutions: One we may characterize as the public high school, another as the private high school, and the third category includes all those illegitimate institutions which do high school work under some different and improper terminology.

1. The public high school is at present making great progress in the South, but this progress has not been so rapid nor so satisfactory as has been claimed by many. It is chiefly noted in states where the state university has taken the lead and endeavored to build up public schools in order to prepare students for its own classes. State institutions have peculiar obligations resting upon them in connection with this work. Much good ought to be accomplished by the action of the General Board of Education in

establishing chairs of secondary education in various institutions throughout the South. The professors filling these chairs should give themselves largely to that work and should be the means of building up and improving high schools throughout their various states. In some states there is an encouraging movement for county high schools, in others for agricultural district schools, and many of our larger cities are introducing manual training high schools as well as improving the old classical high school. These are all good and hopeful signs, but we must remember that improvements of this character come slowly and must be fostered from above. Without the constant supervision and direction of colleges and universities there is no guarantee that public high schools will really fulfill their mission. Many public schools have adopted the fashion of calling the last four years in their course a high school course, no matter where it ends. A few years ago Dr. Harris, U. S. Commissioner of Education, prepared an article giving a most cheering account of the growth of the public high school in the South. In the article he records for the State of Tennessee 100 public high schools, 25 of which report a four year high school course. Altogether, he thinks 5,000 pupils are enrolled in these public high schools in that state. These returns are startling, especially when one on investigation finds that the report of the Commissioner on which these statistics are based gives only a three year high school course for such cities as Nashville, Knoxville, Jackson, Murfreesboro, and Columbia. In fact, only Chattanooga and Memphis of the larger cities claimed to have a four year course. The 23 other high schools cited by the Commissioner as having a four year high school course are in some of the most unexpected localities. White's Store reports a four year course with one teacher and twenty-five pupils. Piney Flats reports a four year course with one teacher and twenty-one pupils. Chuckey City, a four year course with one woman teacher and six pupils. From such statistics as these it is dangerous to make too hasty generalizations, and we dare not congratulate ourselves that in Tennessee, at least, the progress is as real as reported.

2. There are many private schools in the South doing admirable work as high schools. In most cases these schools bear a definite relation to existing colleges and universities. Sometimes

they are owned and controlled by them. In nearly every case they have been built up by university influence and are kept alive by university traditions and ideals. Some of these schools, like those belonging to the Randolph-Macon system in Virginia, are large boarding schools with extensive plant and property. Other colleges, as Wofford, Trinity, or the University of the South at Sewanee, conduct training schools in close relation to their college work. Other institutions, like Vanderbilt University, have built up training schools, wide scattered and independent, but still all under University influence. This same influence has caused the establishment of university schools in such cities as Memphis, Atlanta, Montgomery, and Mobile. These schools are flourishing and are sending students to all the universities of the South and North.

3. Undoubtedly the larger part of high school work in the South has been done for forty years by institutions not calling themselves high schools at all. While the proportion of work done today by these illegitimate institutions is perhaps not so large as it was twenty years ago, it is still large enough to awaken our serious consideration and to call forth our severest condemnation. This work is today done by normal colleges of every grade and description, by a whole host of colleges and seminaries for young women, by preparatory classes in colleges and universities and technological schools, and, finally, by college classes themselves in these same institutions.

It can readily be seen that it is hard to build up a true system of education where we are confronted with this constant duplication of educational work. Why should a state provide a technological school and a state university to do the same work that is done in the public high school? How can a state expect to build up a genuine system of public high schools when it allows that system to be torn down by the standards and requirements of its own higher institutions? The state is in the same position as a merchant would be, should he sell the same article under one label as tallow, under another as oleomargarine, under another as butter. If our state normal schools would require even two years of high school work they might accomplish a more creditable amount of professional work and fit better teachers in a shorter time to take their places in the

common schools. If our schools of technology could cease teaching the elements of English grammar and arithmetic, they might be able to do more with agriculture, engineering, and the various forms of industry. They might contribute more largely to the development of the South's material prosperity and thus prepare the way for social and intellectual progress. If our colleges and universities would concentrate their money and attention on legitimate college students they might become universities in fact as well as in name, and they certainly would contribute to the upbuilding of a general system of high schools throughout the South.

That these remarks may not seem too vague and theoretical and lacking in definiteness, I cite two well known Southern institutions. One of these is called an agricultural and mechanical college; it has the benefit of some contributions from the general government for this work. The institution in question has more than 700 students; of these about 600 are really doing high school work. This is in a state that is trying to build up public high schools. In another state one hears the charge that the state university is one of the greatest obstacles to the development of the public high school. It is claimed that the university takes pupils from the first and second year of the high school, or even at the completion of the eighth grade. An examination of the catalogue of this university seems to indicate that if all students could be excluded who ought to be in the high school, the number would be reduced from 400 to 100.

An examination of the entrance requirements of Southern institutions bears out the same story and emphasizes the contentions that have been made. None of our Southern institutions have done all they should have done in the matter of entrance requirements, and most of them have done next to nothing. It is perfectly clear that in this matter we may trust the statements of the catalogues. We may be perfectly sure that no institution enforces more rigid requirements than are advertised in public announcements. It might be safe to discount these public requirements somewhat, for there are traditions that students are sometimes admitted by institutions on even more favorable terms than the catalogues would indicate. I do not claim that Southern institutions have not been making progress. They have been

striving very earnestly in many directions. They are now engaged in a universal and vigorous endeavor to secure larger resources, more money for endowment, more buildings and better equipment. This is all well enough; but it is not well enough that they are now and have been for many years engaged in a wild strife for numbers. This has been the goal of ambition on the part of trustees and faculty and students. A steady increase in numbers has been advanced as proof of healthy growth in every particular. This is made the basis for petitions to legislatures for larger appropriations, for movements for endowment, and for appeals to philanthropists. In order to secure this increase in numbers, educational standards have sometimes been thrown away and genuine work has been too often sacrificed. It is with great satisfaction that one contemplates the action of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. It is well that this corporation has been transformed from a charitable or philanthropic enterprise into an educational one, and that it purposes to use its influence in the establishment of sound and satisfactory standards for college work. It is quite likely that the position taken by the Carnegie Foundation will be epoch-making and we shall doubtless see a universal rating of educational institutions in terms fixed by this Board. So far as the present question of admission requirements is concerned the Carnegie Board has determined that these requirements must include four years of high school work and this work has been expressed by them in fourteen units, each unit supposed to be one year of high school work with five daily recitations per week. It will be seen, then, that an institution whose requirements for admission cover only ten units admits high school students with one year less than the full amount, while six or seven units means only half the high school course. May we not commend this action of the Carnegie Board to the General Board of Education? At the risk of seeming to be presumptuous, I venture to suggest that the General Board could revolutionize Southern college standards by the adoption of similar principles. It may be well in some cases to require an institution to raise additional money in order to secure assistance from the General Board. Would it not in other cases be quite as desirable to require such an institution to meet educational requirements

rather than financial, to make advance in curriculum rather than erect a new dormitory, to have a better institution rather than a larger one?

I give herewith an interpretation of the admission requirements of four institutions selected from among those to whom assistance has been given or promised by the General Board. I take these institutions because the stamp of approval of the General Board is significant. It is sufficient to say that these are worthy institutions, among the best in their sections. One of them, for instance, requires for admission $5\frac{1}{2}$ units, but all students taking a degree will have also to present Latin, which will bring the admission requirements up to $8\frac{1}{2}$ units. Another institution requires $5\frac{1}{2}$ units for admission and freely allows such a student to take any degree of the university. Neither Latin nor Greek being required for a degree, a student who enters on $5\frac{1}{2}$ units can proceed and finish his course without any further concern so far as entrance requirements go. Another institution requires for admission to the B. S. course $6\frac{1}{2}$ units and for admission to the B. A. course $7\frac{1}{2}$ units. A fourth institution requires for admission to one degree course $7\frac{1}{2}$ units, to another degree course $6\frac{1}{2}$ units, and to another degree course $5\frac{1}{2}$ units. I beg to emphasize the point already made that in these illustrations no effort has been made to find low grade institutions. One of them is a state university; all of them are institutions of excellent standing and well thought of in the South. I am trying to show how universal is the condition of low entrance requirements for Southern institutions.

In this connection it is instructive to note the experience of the Association of College and Preparatory Schools of the Southern States. This Association is now thirteen years old. It was formed as a union of certain institutions willing to pledge themselves to the adoption of a few definite educational reforms. These were, first, the abandonment of preparatory classes; second, the holding of written entrance examinations; third, the establishment of a fair grade of entrance requirements. The entrance requirements agreed to have been and are still much lower than they ought to be. An irregular student may be admitted to college on $5\frac{1}{2}$ units of high school work, but all candidates for degrees are supposed to stand entrance examinations covering $10\frac{1}{2}$ units of

work. At the time of the establishment of this Association there were only six institutions willing to enter into this agreement. In the thirteen years of its history we have added twelve other institutions to our membership. Of course we have always had the support of a large number of preparatory schools. There are still today in the South states in which no institution is willing or able to meet the requirements of the Southern College Association. It is also charged—frankness compels me to say—that the institutions retaining membership do not always strictly obey the requirements of the Association.

The question forces itself upon us, whether these low standards of work are necessary, whether there is any peculiar institution or peculiar atmosphere in the South that makes it impossible for Southern colleges to elevate their freshman class above the second or third year of the public high school. I am quite familiar with all arguments that are advanced in favor of low requirements and preparatory classes. I am well aware of the historical explanation of our condition. I have lived through all the phases of Southern educational work from the time of the Civil War until today. The claim I make is not that we should have come by any other and different road, but that we should have moved faster than we have moved and that we could be moving today where in many cases we are sitting still and resting or sleeping. I do claim that the present low standard of Southern requirements is not necessary. We could do better than we are doing. One of the greatest needs in the South today is for a score of colleges and universities to stand forth in a body and enforce standards of admission and of work such as I have been describing, equal in all respects to the standards enforced by the best institutions of the North, the East and the West. Many of our state universities are able to take this position. It is not true that their support would be cut off in consequence of such a movement. It is the duty of state universities to educate legislatures, to advocate what is right and true, and to lead in sound educational progress. If we wait until we are all rich, have all the buildings we want, all the endowment we want and all the students we want, it is perfectly clear that our educational salvation will be postponed to that happy day when knowledge shall have vanished away.

Heretofore I have been speaking of the better class of colleges and universities. We must not forget, however, that for one such institution there are half a dozen low grade institutions in the South whose standard falls still lower than has been described, and the question remains, what can be done with these? Is there no hope for such institutions? Are there any influences that can be brought to bear either for their amelioration, conversion or annihilation? So far as these institutions are honorable in birth and origin and honest in work, it is not impossible to find a valuable field for them to occupy. Such institutions should be constituted as junior colleges; that is, colleges giving a thorough high school course and adding to it the freshman and perhaps the sophomore years. For this work large libraries and extensive laboratories are not required. Most of the work is done in English, mathematics and the languages. Teachers of supreme ability are, however, an absolute necessity. Such work ought not to be rewarded with the ordinary baccalaureate degrees, but could be rewarded with diplomas or certificates. Many of these institutions are denominational in character and can be reached through denominational agencies. Church colleges ought to respond speedily to any general movement for honest work and honest name. In some of the churches educational interests are put in charge of connectional boards having oversight over all the work of the whole denomination. This removes these questions from the narrowness of local control and enables a church to establish a general system and a universal standard. Such conditions are hopeful and indicate the possibility of the reforms that we have advocated. But there are other institutions of the same character, low in standard and in work, that are purely private and commercial institutions, founded for making money, carried on by intellectual charlatans. Such institutions are pretentious in name in inverse proportion to real merit. They claim all the virtues, both educational and ethical. I see nothing to be done with such institutions except openly and relentlessly to wage war against them. In the final issue the state ought to come to the attack. The work of these institutions is essentially immoral in practice and in character, and the state ought to withhold its charters from all such enterprises. The power of granting degrees ought to be so hedged about as to preserve the

value of these degrees and to make impossible the existence of fraudulent educational enterprises. Selling degrees is a crime that has been punished by our courts, but it is no less a crime to sell or give away educational degrees without any attempt to maintain honest standards. Any group of persons so desiring, in almost any state, without an acre of land or a building or a dollar's worth of property, can secure a charter authorizing them to confer all literary and professional degrees. Boom towns have started universities as an advertisement. Churches have begun enterprises to spite other churches or to pre-occupy a promising field. Over and over again have I come in contact with lives that have been marred and almost ruined by the work of such institutions. This work is not worthless because it is of low grade; it is worthless because it is dishonest in practice, in spirit and in name. To make shoddy is as honorable as to make broadcloth, and far more necessary; but to make shoddy and call it broadcloth and sell it at two dollars per yard ought to land a man in the penitentiary. Such a condition of affairs is worthy the consideration of every state through its governing bodies. If the state needs to lend its strong arm to save its citizens from impure food, from low standard coal oil and low grade fertilizers, it can also afford to protect them from imposition and deceit in that higher realm where soul life is quickened and the light of truth should ever burn pure and bright.

In concluding this discussion I ask permission to cite the experience of one Southern institution in dealing with the various matters that have been considered. The institution in question opened its doors just thirty years ago. In the beginning no preparation was made for preparatory students, and fair and reasonable admission requirements were fixed; but with the first session a crowd of earnest and untrained students poured into the college halls. A large number of courses that had been provided was found to be unsuited and uncalled for, while there was found to be an eager demand for elementary work in English, mathematics, Latin, and Greek. The institution, therefore, found itself compelled to begin preparatory classes, for it was not considered feasible to reject two-thirds of those who presented themselves for matriculation in the first year. These preparatory classes were conducted for twelve years under protest. They were not

advertised and no effort was made to secure students for them. In 1887 steps were taken looking to the abolition of these classes, which was accomplished in the next two years. The attendance of the institution fell from 188 to 112, a loss of 40 per cent. There was from the very beginning, however, a great improvement in the character of the student body. Instead of a mass of raw material, unprepared for college life and college duties, uncertain as to plans and purposes educationally, there was a homogeneous band, earnest and enthusiastic, with high aspirations and ideals. Every student seemed to feel the change. There was an increase of intellectuality in the very atmosphere. The higher classes began to grow larger, graduate work was developed, and every part of the college organization was keyed to a higher tone. Numbers began to increase steadily and training schools sprang up as legitimate feeders for the university. Within four years the attendance had regained its normal point and from that time continued to show slow increase. Requirements for admission were raised from time to time and requirements for graduation were kept on a constant high plane. A marked difference was exhibited almost immediately in the number of graduates. For the six years preceding the abolition of preparatory classes the average attendance of the academic department was 188.5 and the average number of graduates was 8.3, or one graduate to every 22.5 students. For the first six years under the new system without preparatory classes the average attendance was 185.5, while the average number of graduates was 22.5, or one graduate to every 8.3 students. For the last six years, closing with the year 1906, the average attendance in the academic department has been 228 students and the average number of graduates 38.8, or one graduate to every 5.8 students. These figures indicate more strongly than any words can do the change in the character of the student body. More important still is the result that has been accomplished for the general cause of education through the establishment of training schools designed to prepare students for this institution and others like it. In the fall of 1903 seventy-five students entered the university in question from schools more or less directly affiliated with it. Within the past ten years ten schools have furnished the freshman class with more than five hundred students, an average of more than

fifty students per year. It must be remembered also that these training schools have exercised and still exercise a great influence over the lives of many students who never reached college. Perhaps not one-fifth of the number that attend such schools in the first year of their course finally complete the curriculum and enter the university, but the influence of the training school on these lives is of incalculable benefit. Such is the experience of one institution, and I believe that it has a valuable lesson for the whole South. What has been done in one case can be done in many others. To the writer of this paper it is a matter of sincere and pardonable pride that he has been permitted to take some part, however small, in the work thus described.

Giosue Carducci

BY ANTONIO MARINONI,

Professor of Romance Languages in the University of Arkansas

In the death of Giosuè Carducci Italy has lost not only its greatest poet, but also a venerable figure—one of the few remaining of those who, consecrated in thought and life to the glorious work, saw the destiny of their native land accomplished.

It would be difficult to make final judgment as to the place that Carducci is to take among the great names of Italian literature. One might venture to say that in the ensemble of his varied literary productions—never was such variety—and in all his manifestations excellent, his is an unequaled excellence; one might dare to utter the partial opinion that he is the greatest poet of the century and may be compared only to the great of earlier times, finding his equals on the roll that claims a Petrarca, a Tasso, a Dante. But impressions are still too recent; the foreshortening of events must be dissolved, and final judgment must be left to time.

I cannot refrain from quoting such a curiosity of criticism as: "He was not a man of international fame and therefore not a genius of anything like the first rank." As if universal popularity were the touchstone of genius! The truth is that Carducci's genius is at once so intensely national in character and so universal, his style is so noble, his versification so aristocratic, his thought content so individual, that he is a poet of the few, and the circle of appreciation has not yet become and may never be of largest circumference. He is still the poet of a nation; hardly has there been time for him to find place with those poets who are a world possession.

It is intended here to give the Italian view-point, to set forth how and why it is that Carducci is held to be the national poet of Italy; and upon this fact such questions as his Humanism, Paganism or Hellenism have no direct bearing. Exclusive of the debatable ground, there is the more direct and solid message of higher ideals that has endeared him to the hearts of his countrymen. His unflinching patriotism, the steadfast sincerity with

which he voiced what he thought to be true and good—these make him the national poet of Italy. I say unfaltering patriotism, and here a word might be said concerning his reconciliation to the monarchy. The first of the "Odi barbare" appealed strongly to Queen Margherita. In appreciation of her praise—and it was discriminating praise—he dedicated to her the famous ode "Alla regina d'Italia." The noble intentions of the poet were misconstrued, and especially by the republicans. But not by the discerning of these, for Aurelio Soffi said to him: "I compliment you for your beautiful ode. You have given a most noble proof of how exquisitely gentle the Italian spirit can be." Later on, becoming convinced that under the monarchy alone his country could maintain union and progress, he gave adherence to the monarchy, and in 1890 consented to become senator of the kingdom.

The salient points in the life of the poet are few. Born in Valdicastello, a village in Tuscany, the eldest of three sons, he passed his first years in a village of the Maremma, where his father was municipal physician. During the revolutionary movement of 1848 Carducci's father lost his office and the family removed to Florence, where Giosuè was put to study in the college of the Scolopian brothers. In 1853 he entered the Scuola Normale Superiore of Pisa, where he graduated in 1856. He taught for a short while in the *ginnasio* of San Miniato, and then again removed to Florence, where he remained until 1859. Until 1860 he taught in the *liceo* Pistoia. The attention of the minister of public instruction was attracted to him through the medium of his collection of Italian classics, published during this period of teaching. And in 1861 he was given the professorship of Italian Literature in the University of Bologna. In Bologna he taught over forty years. There he continued to live after he gave up his university duties, and there he died on February 16th of this year.

Of the mission of the teacher few had so high a conception as Carducci. His aims were manifold—to arouse in his students a keener enthusiasm for scholarship, making of literary culture a high calling, to bring them to consider literature as a "palestra" for nobility and virtue of spirit, an aim and end in itself. To Carducci the superior philological culture was not an arid field where intelligence is fossilized; it was rather a means toward a

more catholic comprehension of literature. So, also, he accepted the contribution of modern science and doctrine, not as ends in themselves, but as vivifying adjuvants of the great national traditions—of these, he taught, literary men must be the defenders and custodians. He knew intimately all the greater modern literatures, and by rational and æsthetic comparisons drawn from these, he sought to teach Italians to free themselves from servility and to stimulate them to imitation of the best in form. Another of his great tasks was that of educating his pupils in letters, to praise the synthetic more than the analytic qualities. And he was disappointed that the evolution of modern literature assumed the form of a supremacy of schools. "Today," he said, "in literature we dismember that which is essentially organic, and we applaud ourselves, thinking that such dismemberment is a progress in art. What is the significance of realism and its claim, in virtue of its recency, exclusively to occupy the field? It signifies that we do not know, we can no longer invent and imagine: therefore we describe; it signifies that we do not know and cannot embrace and comprehend all the ages: and we photograph the present. The great artists of the great centuries were at once idealists and realists, social and individual, historians and poets, penetrating analysts and plastic moulders, men of their time and of all times." This thought, which repeatedly appears in the work of Carducci, seems to sum itself up in an opposition to the formula: Art for art's sake. Not that Carducci did not think that form is more absolute than is admitted, and that only works of great style are permanent, but Carducci aimed to declare himself a partisan of a literature that should be educative and useful. He was therefore openly opposed to those tendencies of the century which finding focus in Flaubert, make of art something disinterested, void of moral intention; and these ideas, which inform all his literary productions, Carducci proclaimed from the cathedra with such earnestness and sincerity that soon he received the admiration and assent of the best minds of Italy. From everywhere in the kingdom young men came to Bologna, caught the inspiration of the master, and passing afterwards to teaching and other activities in life, they perpetuated and expanded the influence of the doctrine received. Among his living famous disciples are Guido Mazzoni and Pascoli, who succeeded

him at Bologna. Contemporary Italian literature is irradiated with the light of his genius. Carducci made no attempt by popularity to captivate the weak; he was content with the approval of the elect. "A voluntary or forced accord with the many is verily a vile burden," he said. He sought simplicity rather than glory. He was inexorable with charlatans, and severe to those who merely sought diversion in the study of literature. When his fame became universal in the land, many would come to hear his lectures; they came away disappointed; for instead of the seer they found the sober scholar.

Finally, better to understand the work of Carducci as a teacher, it must be observed that the greater part of his production in the field of criticism was primarily part of his professional work and accordingly his best writings show him both as scholar and as teacher.

As a writer of prose Carducci has fulfilled the secular tradition of Italy—that great poets must also be great prose writers. Roughly classified in terms of subject matter his prose writings—some fifteen volumes in all—fall into the following groups:

1. General studies in historical literary criticism—such as *The Development of National Literature*, *The Literary Awakening in Italy*, *The Development of the Ode in Italy*, *A Survey of Literature During the Period of the Italian Risorgimento*.
2. Critical and biographical studies of great literary artists—such as Dante, Petrarca, Boccaccio, Manzoni, etc.
3. Addresses commemorative of historical and literary men—Goffredo Mameli, Aurelio Saffi, Garibaldi, Leopardi, Victor Hugo, Shelley.
4. Finally, a large quantity of prose of a personal character, polemic and professional in form, dealing with various questions in literature, politics, art, criticism. Of this last class especially excellent productions are the bitter controversy, "Criticism and Art," and the defense of "Ca Ira."

Now since it would be impossible here separately to analyze any of the productions, we shall attempt only to elucidate the essence and inherent qualities of the whole. As far as concerns language, Carducci had the advantage of birth in Tuscany. The language of Tuscany is the Italian language. Here he became master of the most recondite forms of the language.

The elegance of his diction, his resources in composition and in structure, the richness of his vocabulary are such that his prose is one of the most varied and most original possessed by Italian literature.

Whether he comprehends in a marvelous synthesis the literary evolution of the first centuries in Italy, or whether he presents alive great figures in literature, what is most patent is the many-sidedness of his criticism. A partial criticism he abhorred. He opposed the view that criticism consists in the separate treatment of various aspects. The "*faculté maitresse*" must rule, and this Carducci brought in Italy to its greatest development; this he did by patient scrutiny, by coördinating with sure insight all those varied and complex elements of an individual or a national evolution. In his criticism the foremost characteristic is the historical characteristic.

To the research of a literary figure or period Carducci moves with the care, impartiality and sureness of touch of a great investigator. There is no fact that his intelligence does not apprehend, penetrate and enlighten. His criticism is historical in the broadest sense of the word; it is at the same time subjective and objective—objective in its consideration of the form of works of art, subjective in that all elements discriminated by a profound study of interelemental relations are finally compounded into an organic living whole. And this work of final reconstruction is the final witness to his insight and impartiality of judgment.

Through his commemorative orations he has also left a lasting impression; and especially by those in memory of heroes of the Italian Risorgimento. These are important, not so much for that they show Carducci to be the greatest orator of his time, but because in them his generous nature is more openly and intensely displayed. Here he shows himself in the sincerity of his intentions, the courage of his opinions. Masterly in form and in style, artless, warm, serene and always noble, each oration seems to be a pæan that bursts spontaneously and irresistibly from the soul. And when we consider his steadfast disinterestedness it will not be difficult to understand his ascendancy over the hearts and minds of his hearers. He spoke because he must.

"Such is my respect for, or better my conception of, the art of speaking, of writing, of liberty, that I speak and write only when

I see fit. That is to say, when intellect and heart prompt me," he said; or even more strongly: "I do not write to order, or upon request. To sit down and spoil white paper and soil your fingers when you have nothing new or good or even apposite to say—business of that kind, I, with the Romans, would leave to slaves." The occasioning circumstances of the orations determine their essence. Generally sober in speech and in thought, frequently Carducci was carried away in the intensity of his feeling and rose to dazzling heights. The most popular of his addresses, that on the Death of Giuseppe Garibaldi, might seem to be purely romantic eloquence; but the ideality of its conceptions has firm base on historical truth, and upon this foundation it becomes vision and prophecy. And he was an Italian and a great poet; warmth and impetuosity of emotion were native. Eloquence brought him down to the people; they discerned his sincerity.

Brilliance and vividness are to be found in his prose of the last class—the personal confessions and polemics. Much of this prose is a reverberation of the poetic battles of "*Giambi ed Epodi*." Delicately poised, the poet's soul was responsive to the events of his own life, and to the stream of public life. Under the bitter criticism of his political works he could not remain silent. He could not pardon what he considered offenses against his self-respect and liberty as an artist and a freeman. Certainly the defenses of Carducci have not greatly influenced public opinion. The questions at debate were settled even before they were opened, and in the course of time the incompetency of his critics would have been demonstrated; and since the task was one of compulsion, self-compulsion albeit, completeness of spontaneity was not attained. The controversial writings are therefore on account of their very nature, of lesser and diminishing import. Still there are examples of exquisite prose, and they do contain other elements than the personal. Carducci defends himself, but beyond any defense he shows that he has at heart, and combats for, the higher ideals of truth, of justice, and of liberty. Controversial literature is always ephemeral. And it is these extra-controversial elements that give permanence to his prose of the last class. From prose we pass now to a consideration of Carducci's poetry.

It will be impossible to examine the poetic production of Car-

ducci in its entirety. But we may discuss those characteristics which permeate the whole. Foremost is the characteristic of patriotism. The patriotic spirit changes with time; and with its changes in Italy Carducci has identified himself. He makes tangible and visible the intangible and invisible evolution of the national spirit. At the same time, accompanying and coördinate, there is the wonderful development of the purely poetical faculties, in him the exhibition of the unique process. In Verdi alone, in another field of art, can be found a comparison.

We shall consider briefly the salient characteristics of Carducci's poetry as they evolve and are determined from epoch to epoch. Carducci was one of the many who in '59 and '60 accepted the motto of Garibaldi, "Italy and Victor Emmanuel." Then followed the war of '59, ending with the treaty of Villafranca. Italian overprudence in diplomacy led finally in '62 to the arrest of Garibaldi in Aspromonte. The poet could no longer keep down his inborn revolutionary spirit; he withdrew from the party of monarchy and enrolled in the opposing republican party. After the defeats of the war of '66, the poet's soul hovered on the verge of despair. The impermanencies of the new Italian government brought about Mentana in '67, and in '70 the Italian troops made penitential entrance into Rome. Said Carducci: "The Italian government ascended the triumphal road as if it were the holy stairs; with a rope about its neck, and with folded arms, it bowed to right and left and begged for mercy." The poet was opposed to an opportunistic policy; he wanted entrance into Rome to be an entrance of revolution. Such is the spiritual environment, and such were the events which found voice in the poems of "*Levia Gravia*," and especially "*Giambi ed Epodi*." The latter refer more particularly to the events from '67 to '72. Of the famous "*Hymn to Satan*," composed in one night in '63 and published in '65, it suffices to say that it made such stir that Carducci, indignant at being called "the poet of Satan," took refuge in bitter condemnation of the poem: "Never did an effort so vulgar (save five or six stanzas) come from my hands." This poem has attained exaggerated importance outside of Italy. Patriotic sentiment forms the main motive of the "*Giambi ed Epodi*."

We may say that the poet goes too far and in these poems

("Giambi ed Epodi") there are certain stains that unpardonably offend the chastity of the muse. In his art, Carducci, gradually putting aside a certain imitation of the classics, matures and prepares his genius for more original forms. And from civil and political satire the poet passes in the "Nuove Poesie" to less stormy and turbid waters. Here it is love, the pastoral quiet of the fields, mediæval episodes expressed in epic-lyric form, and always an expression of nature esoterical and exoterical. The success of the book was immediate; the poet's fame was securely fixed. More varied as to subject matter, naturally in the "Nuove Poesie" there is greater variation in artistic expression. There is in these poems more of meditation, greater sureness of touch, more self-possession, greater originality of form. They are a promise of yet higher attainments.

At this time Carducci was especially interested in the study of the German language and literature. This fact is significant in considering the transition from the "Nuove Poesie" to the "Odi Barbare." Particularly is this true in what concerns metrics. The innovations made by Carducci in the field of metrics, conversant as he was with the models of the ancients, gained support from the splendid results obtained by the Germans. The "Odi Barbare" are a product of the matured genius of Carducci. We must therefore consider some of their more important elements; and in the following order: First, the question of metrical form; secondly, the question of content, the humanistic content, an expression of that mood of thought which tends to exalt humanity at the expense of Christianity, and finally, the not less important aspect of paganism.

The attempt of Carducci to revive old meters in Italian metrics was more than an attempt; it was an achievement. The poet did all that the resources of the language would permit. Similar attempts had already been made by certain poets of the XVI century in Italy, France, England and Germany. Such attempts were mere *tours de force*. In England imitation of classic meters was resumed in the XIX century. Notable success was attained by Tennyson, Browning (in translation), and Swinburne. And I scarcely need to mention the poem "Evangeline," by Longfellow in America. In Germany imitation was most successful at the hands of Schiller, Klopstock, Platen, and Goethe. In Italy the

undertaking of Carducci was considered to be so daring that it met with little encouragement. Many years passed before the work of the poet was accepted.

The earlier attempts of the XVI century were unsuccessful for two reasons: there was lack of poetic genius and generally a rigid application of the laws of Latin prosody to the words of modern languages. No attention was paid to tonic accent, and meter was based, as with the Latins, exclusively on quantity. Now, it is true that in modern languages a quantitative value of syllables subsists, but for us it has become of minimal importance. Tonic accent reigns to the exclusion of accent based on quantity. This displacement of quantity accent by tonic accent has been a secular process. For centuries we have been accustomed to the substitution. The few imitators of Latin verse in the XVI century attempted to introduce phonetic changes which were in opposition to the very genius of the language. This mistake was avoided by the XIX century imitators; in lieu of reproducing the technical structure of Latin verse, they essayed to imitate its harmony by maintaining correspondence of tonic and rhythmic accent. The success of such an attempt is measured by the possibilities of a language.

The "Odi Barbare" made the name of the poet known to the learned of all Europe. He found the greatest appreciation in Germany, where many of the poems were translated by Betty Iacopson, Paul Heyse, and Mommsen. Translations were made in France by Julien Lugol and in England by J. E. Green and others. As to the title "Odi Barbare," they were so called as if to signify that the poet's aim was not to reproduce the heroic meters in all their inherent qualities, but rather to enlarge the field of formal metrics in the lyric poetry of Italy. The meters, happily used, are in harmony with the substance of the poems, but their glory is altogether independent of metrical questions. And so they found audience with all Italians.

In the "Odi Barbare" there is permeating the whole a systematic opposition to the church. During all his life Carducci clung to this ecclesiastical aversion. This aversion was not blind or partisan; it was determined by actual experience, strengthened by a study of the history and literature of Italy. In his greatest critical works he expresses this view with calm and ordination;

in his lyrics he voices the same conviction, embracing different epochs with wonderful historical insight and drawing his views from objective antagonisms. The splendid ode, "Alle fonti del Clitunno," is an opportune example. However, we must not expect to find him absolutely rigid. Poetry cannot be the voice of inflexibility, and Carducci's heart was stirred by all emotions. The pagan poet who wrote the ode "In una Chiesa gotica," where the pagan spirit finds its largest voice, gave us also that tenderest of lyrics, "La Chiesa di Polenta." None has felt and sung with more inspiration the calm of the Angelus at twilight ringing from the little church where Dante prayed. The last stanzas of the poem are full of incommunicable beauty:

Ave Maria! Quando su l'aure corre
l'umil saluto, i piccoli mortali
scovrono il capo, curvano la fronte
Dante ed Aroldo.
Una di flauti lenta melodia
passa invisibil fra la terra e il cielo:
spiriti forse che furon, che sono,
e che saranno.
Un oblio lene de la faticosa
vita, un pensoso sospirar quiete
una soave volonta di pianto
l'anime invade.
Taccion le fiere e gli uomini e le cose,
roseo'l tramonto ne l'azzurro sfuma,
mormoran gli alti vertici ondegianti
Ave Maria.

In his early years the faith of the poet may not have been strong, but later in life he came to deep belief. It is not then a question of faith; it is the church as an institution that he opposes. His patriotism possibly led him to find in the church the principal cause of the disintegration of political conscience in Italy. Certainly the temporal power of the church was largely responsible for such a decay. Dante himself considered the temporal power of the church pernicious. "Let us be proud," says Carducci in his essay, "L'opera di Dante," "that Dante has been our master and our father in the preservation of Roman tradition to the renovation of Italy; that he has been through the centuries the witness to the bad government of the church and a judge, decreeing that moral necessity demanded its overthrow."

Where the sentiment of patriotism appears with the poet, opposition to the church becomes a duty of patriotism. And where patriotism is not the "leit motif," paganism becomes in the hands of the poet a weapon of destruction, not a means of reconstruction. Consider the most intensely pagan of all his odes, "In una chiesa gotica." Here given is the contrast between the pagan divinity, free without, and the vague aspirations of the kneeling people:

Ma da le mitiche vette di Fiesole
tra le pie storie pe' vetri roseo
guardava Apolline; su l'altar massimo
impallidiano i cerei.

The whole ode is in glorification of life according to pagan naturalism; the poet does not condemn religious feeling in itself; it is the surrounding darkness and mystery that he opposes. The paganism of the poet finds further expression in his high estimation of the artistic beauty of ancient Greece and Rome—and more than this. In the first and second of Carducci's discourses, "On the Development of National Literature," he sets forth the reasons why a real literature had not appeared in Italy except when the people again raised to dignity those principles of Roman society always latent in Italians. Carducci sees incongruity between ecclesiasticism and art. From the time of Dante onward, spite of the influence of the religious idea on modern art, "between Christian aspiration and art there is hatred," he says.

We must grant that Carducci has known and realized the ancients as few others have known and realized them, but we cannot think that Carducci saw life as Horace and Catullus did. His admiration was profound, but it was admiration at a distance of eighteen centuries. He was with all his soul a modern Italian patriot and a poet who was in sympathy with the thought of Mazzini and the deeds of Garibaldi. He may look in admiration to the art of the ancient world, but he is more intimately concerned and touched with the present and with the future. In the ode, "Alle fonti del Clitunno," we admire the wonderful historical representation of a glorious moment of ancient Rome as opposed to the later impotence of Rome. The blame for this impotence Carducci puts upon the church. And in the last stanza:

Plaudono i monti al carme e i boschi e l'acque
de l'Umbria verde; in faccia a noi fumando
ed anelando nuove industrie in corsa
fischia il vapore,

the poet calls us back to the reality of present life; from the Umbrian fields, once witness of the most fateful and heroic events of Rome, comes the applause not only to the song of the poet, but to the efforts of the living toward higher forms of civilization.

Certain paganistic tendencies, handed down through the centuries, still survive in the national Italian character. The old Roman *esprit pratique* still survives. Paganism has lived in popular legends and through ancestral pride. It lives in the historical associations of the remnant monuments and ruins of ancient Rome. These tendencies, this survival, the paganism of Carducci voices.

Finally, in the "Rime e ritmi," production comes to a close. The old emotions, the old enthusiasms persist, tempered by age, softened to an evening glow:

Pace, mio cuor; pace, mio cuore. Oh tanto
Breve la vita ed è sì bello il mondo!

The stormy days are over, the days when the cry was:

. Rendine la patria
a i morti, a i vivi, pe'l fumante sangue
da tutti i campi;
.
a quella polve eroica fremente,
a questa luce angelica esultante,
rendi la patria; Dio, rendi l'Italia,
a gli Italiani.

Patriotism persists, a patriotism now imbued with other worldliness. The call has been answered. A united Italy has been given to Italians, to the living and to the dead, to the heroic dust and all the smoking battlefields.

The stream is quiet now with the quiet of the sea. The flag, the tricolor, floats peacefully:

Fior tricolore
Tramontano le stelle in mezzo al mare,
E si spengono i canti entro il mio core.

The Bible and Modern Scholarship

BY WILBUR F. TILLET,

Dean of Theological Department in Vanderbilt University

The most important and interesting problems that are now occupying the minds of Christians are those pertaining to the Bible, its divine origin, inspiration and authority. The traditional doctrine of the Church concerning the Bible is being afresh inquired into at this time, especially in Germany, England and America; and while that doctrine is being called in question by many and criticised and rejected by some, it is interesting to note that the Bible is being more widely read and more carefully studied than ever before in the history of the world. The time seems fitting, therefore, to restate the doctrines of the Church concerning the Bible, and to present afresh the more striking facts and arguments which go to prove that the Bible is from God, and is, therefore, of infallible authority in all matters of faith and practice. The claims and arguments of the Biblical criticism of the day cannot be ignored by any one and should not be suppressed. In the Protestant view, no doctrine is ever so settled that it may not be taken up and re-examined and resettled. Nothing is ever really settled until it is settled right; and if any point of investigation has been settled aright, it has nothing to lose by being re-examined into. On the other hand, to suppress and forbid free discussion with regard to any doctrine of the Church can only do harm, and is opposed to the free, truth-loving spirit of Protestant Christianity. If now the traditional and long accepted doctrine of the Church concerning the Bible, its divine origin and inspiration, is being called in question by the "higher critics," let us not take fright, but remind ourselves that free discussion is the glory of Protestantism; that it is a sign of life, not of death; that the truth has nothing to fear from being called in question; that it is not tradition or Church authority or the faith of the fathers, but reason and revelation and truth, "as truth is in Jesus," which alone can be the foundation of our faith in this as in other doctrines.

Our fifth Article of Religion says: "In the name of the Holy

Scriptures we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testaments of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church." This statement is not altogether satisfactory as a definition, seeing that there are some books, both in the Old and New Testaments, of whose divine inspiration and authority there has been, and is now, some "doubt in the Church," at least in the minds of many individuals in the Church. But they are certainly not, therefore, to be rejected. When we come to determine the New Testament Scriptures the definition is not satisfactory, for not only is it a well known fact that Martin Luther and his immediate followers denied the divine authorship of several books of the New Testament, but it is also well known that the early Church for several centuries divided the books of the New Testament into two classes: the homologoumena (those agreed upon and accepted), and the antilegomena (those spoken against and held in doubt—for example, 2 Peter, Hebrews, etc.). Not until about the beginning of the fifth century did these doubts cease to trouble the Church. But these doubts and this long suspended judgment as to the inspiration and authority of some half dozen of the books of the New Testament constitute now a strong credential in favor of the genuineness of all the books of the New Testament; for it proves to us, in the most satisfactory manner possible, that the early Church did not, blindly and without sufficient evidence, place in the canon any and every book for which admission was sought, but that it closely scrutinized and carefully inquired into the character and claims of every book, and only when doubts were removed by overwhelming proof was it admitted. "Thomas doubted that we might not doubt," said Augustine; and so the doubts of the early Church with regard to certain books of the New Testament are now a ground for greater confidence, on our part, in their fidelity and judgment in determining the canon, than if they had not doubted at all. And the doubters and critics are still rendering the same kind of service—making us investigate and be sure of the grounds of our confidence. It seems more satisfactory, in our day, to define the Scriptures from their relation to and connection with Christ and their purpose and value as teaching moral and spiritual truth, thus: "By the Holy Scriptures we mean (1) those ancient sacred books of the Jewish Church which Christ and the inspired apostles

used, endorsed, and appealed to as of divine authority; and those sacred books of the New Testament which were written by, or under the direction of, the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ; and (2) those sacred books of the Christian religion which were produced under the guidance of the Holy Spirit for the one great purpose of teaching moral and spiritual truth." All questions of external evidence with regard to the Old and New Testament are properly supplemented and confirmed by an appeal to the internal evidence of each book as to whether its doctrinal and ethical teachings are worthy of a book coming to us from our Lord, and claiming to set forth his will. No book of the Bible, rightly interpreted, and studied in the light of a divine revelation that was progressively imparted, lacks this confirmatory evidence. The question of greatest importance, then, with regard to the sacred canon, is the relation of Christ to the Scriptures and of the Scriptures to Christ. "Search the Scriptures," said Christ; "for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me," and to us it is quite as important to add: "And he it is who testifies of them." The second question of transcendent importance is: "What do these Scriptures teach, in their completed and final form, in the realm of moral and spiritual truth?"

While divine revelation is addressed to man's faith, it is only as a man exercises his reason that his faith is saved from being credulity and superstition. Belief without evidence is credulity, not faith. Faith is belief upon evidence, not without evidence, and reason is that divinely given faculty of the soul whose office it is to sit in judgment upon evidence. We are not only not required to believe without evidence, but belief without evidence—faith that has not exercised reason—is not recognized in the Christian system as any true faith at all. We not only may, but must, exercise reason in order to have Christian faith. To exercise reason and not faith leads to rationalism. To exercise faith and not reason leads to credulity and superstition. Roman Catholicism abounds in this kind of faith. The exercise of both reason and faith is that which distinguishes true Protestant Christianity from rationalism, on the one hand, and Romanism, on the other. Revealed truth (the triunity of the Godhead, for example,) often transcends, but never contradicts, human reason.

Roman Catholicism accepts as an article of faith not only that which transcends reason, but even that which contradicts reason (for example, the doctrine of transubstantiation). The rationalist, on the other hand, refuses to believe not only that which contradicts reason, but also that which transcends reason—that is, in matters of religion and revelation he acts thus; but in other realms and revelations of life he often accepts that which transcends the power of reason, and believes that a thing is when he cannot understand how it is. The true Protestant, while accepting nothing that contradicts reason, yet believes many things which transcend reason. No truth of revelation contradicts reason; if it did, man could not believe it. Faith and reason should never be separated; to them jointly the Bible, containing the revealed will of God, addresses itself.

In emphasizing the divine inspiration and authority of the Bible we should guard against overlooking and underrating the human elements which are a no less essential and conspicuous part of the sacred writings. These human elements are as varied and pronounced as they would be if the writers had received no special influence of the Spirit aiding them in their work. To overlook or ignore these marked differences in the various writers of the sacred canon would rob us of much that is most interesting and instructive in the study of the Scriptures, and would leave no satisfactory explanation of imperfections and discrepancies such as could not be easily reconciled with a book wholly divine. God might have provided us with a complete and perfect Bible in the same manner that he is represented in Exodus as providing us with the tables of the decalogue—by handing it down to us from heaven in a form that needed no work of man even to record it. That he in his wisdom chose, on the contrary, to reveal his will through men, through good but fallible human beings, is not without its profound significance, and we must not fail to learn the full lesson he would teach us thereby.

No one maintains that the Bible as we now have it is entirely free from errors; but these errors, it is claimed, did not belong to the original documents as they came from the hands of the inspired writers, but have crept in since. But to affirm that all the inaccuracies and discrepancies of the Bible, such as textual and historical critics point out, are due wholly to errors of copy-

ists or to interpolations, and that the original autograph copies that came from the hands of the inspired penmen were absolutely without error, is, in the judgment of many, an unwarranted assumption. That this position has its doctrinal advantage cannot be denied, but the affirmation can never be proved. To argue that it is highly important for the Church to have a book which is not only inspired, but absolutely infallible in all particulars, and that as God could keep the inspired men from all errors he surely did so, is an argument that would seem to demand as its logical sequel that God should have also continued to preserve the inspired documents from error as they were transmitted to succeeding generations, and then the existence of an errorless Bible would prove the argument true. But this cannot for a moment be claimed for the Bible as we now have it. The man, however, who rather expects to find in documents that have come through the hands of fallible men some marks of imperfections and error is not concerned over his inability to accurately locate the responsibility for these errors, but concerns himself wholly with the abounding and wonderful evidences that everywhere meet him of the presence of the divine mind and of the fact that, although the Bible has come to us through men, it is most surely from God. He has an easy case in hand who simply undertakes to prove that the Bible contains evidences of a divine revelation and inspiration. But he who claims that the Bible, by virtue of its inspiration, must be absolutely inerrant in all particulars is under obligation to account for every error, even the least, that may be pointed out, and indeed for all those obscurities and difficulties which make some parts of it unintelligible to modern readers, and which, it would seem, are quite as irreconcilable with its divine inspiration as the few errors which it may contain.

There is a divine-human Person, a divine-human Book, and a divine-human Institution. In the person of Christ, the divine and human, God and man, were perfectly united, without mixture or confusion. The human nature of Jesus was as "very man" as if it had sustained no vital union with the eternal Logos; and as a free moral agent, we think it follows inevitably that the human Jesus could have erred. But, in the exercises of his freedom, he did not err, and herein is the glory of his triumph over tempta-

tion and of his example to us, not that it was impossible for him to sin, but that he could sin, but did not. In regard to the divine-human institution, the Church, however, we must say that, while it is possible for it not to err, yet, as a matter of fact, it has erred and does err (at least such is the Protestant doctrine, though the Papal doctrine is that the Church is infallible and cannot err). The Holy Spirit, though incarnate within the Church, and though working in it and through it, does not prevent the human element in the Church from error; and the papal doctrine of the infallibility of the Church is not only contradicted by the facts of history, but brings the Church under criticism and into a disrepute which is aggravated by these high and unwarranted claims of infallibility—claims that are no where made for the Church by Christ or the apostles, though they call it the pillar and ground of the truth. Yet in spite of the fact that the Church is liable to err, and has erred, and does err, the Holy Spirit works through it and makes it the authoritative teacher in the world of truth pertaining to salvation. Not only does God work through a fallible Church, but, as the Church is made up of individuals, he works through fallible and imperfect men and women. If God had deigned to work only through human beings that are perfect and free from error, he would never have done any work in the world except through the man Christ Jesus. As to the divine-human Person, then, we say that he could err, but did not err, and as to the divine-human Church we say it could err and has erred.

Have the Roman Catholics gained anything by claiming absolute infallibility for the church? Have they not rather lost by it and brought it under criticism and into disrepute by claiming for the Church that which it plainly does not possess, viz., absolute freedom from error in all things? There is but one answer to this question. The Protestant conception of the Church, even though it may be called a lower doctrine than that of Rome, commends itself to men of reason everywhere, and this because it accords with the facts.

How now about the divine-human Book that comes between Christ and the Church? Can the Bible and its inspired writers be in error, or did the divine element so dominate and override the human in its production as to render the latter incapable of error? The old traditional view put it on a par with Christ and affirmed that it was absolutely without error. The new theology

classifies it with the Church. Have the inspired writers erred, and does the Bible contain mistakes? Well, if the Bible does contain mistakes, says the advocate of the new view, I am not, therefore, going to say that its writers could not be divinely inspired, and that it cannot be an authoritative and divinely revealed expression of the will of God. For I am sure that, if it does contain mistakes, these mistakes belong to the human and not to the divine elements in the Bible, and are wholly attributable to fallible men and not to the infallible Spirit. I am now prepared to read my Bible without any embarrassment when I have reached this mental position—a position attended with much less embarrassment than I should be in if I felt that the discovery of any errors would prove that the writers could not be inspired and the Bible could not be God's book. And if perchance I find, as I think I shall, that the Bible contains few if any errors that affect in the least its trustworthiness as an expression of divine truth concerning the redeeming will of God, I shall be all the more pleased with the result reached. Whether the Bible, then, contains any mistakes or not, is simply a question of fact to be decided through examination by competent judges like all matters pertaining to historical criticism.

"Every book of the Bible, every chapter of it, every verse of it, every word of it, every syllable of it, every letter of it, is the direct utterance of the Most High, supreme, absolute, faultless, unerring." "Every syllable of it is just what it would be had God spoken from heaven without the intervention of any human agent." "God presided over the sacred writers in their entire work of writing, with the design and effect of making that writing an errorless record." "A proved error in the Scripture contradicts not only our doctrine, but the Bible claims, and therefore its inspiration in making those claims." "Chronological and geographical details, as well as matters of physical science mentioned in the Bible, must in every portion of every book be held to have been stated with infallible accuracy." "This infallibility and authority attach as well to the verbal expression in which the revelation is conveyed, as to the revelation itself." "Scripture is infallible truth, free from all error, each and everything contained in it is absolute truth, be it doctrine, morals, history, chronology, topography, proper names." These quotations represent the views of such writers as Dean Burgon, Gaussen, Turretin, Hodge,

Lee and others, who have written in defense of the traditional Church doctrine. They call their doctrine that of "plenary inspiration," but it is usually designated by those who oppose it as the mechanical or verbal theory of inspiration.

It will thus be seen that the contention of all who hold this view is that a document cannot possess infallible authority in any respect unless it be absolutely free from errors in all respects and of all kinds, and therefore the writers, it is assumed, must have been divinely secured against the possibility of errors by a special influence of the Holy Ghost imparted for this very purpose. But is this doctrine of an absolutely errorless Bible essential to the true doctrine of inspiration, and is it supported by analogy and confirmed by a close study in detail of the Bible itself? That there is an increasing number of devout and earnest students of the Bible within the Church who do not accept the high doctrine which has just been set forth cannot be denied. It is well for us, therefore, to point out how and why some who believe in the inspiration and divine authority of the Bible have yet felt compelled to modify the doctrine which teaches that all the writings of inspired men were divinely secured against the possibility of any and all mistakes. According to their view the discovery of occasional errors—for example, of chronology, geography, history, and the like—which may be traced to the distinctly human element in the Bible is a thing rather to be expected than otherwise, and it is unwise to make the inspiration and authority of the Bible, as a revelation of God's will in matters of moral and spiritual truth, stand or fall with the claims of absolute inerrancy that are made in its behalf by the advocates of the former view.

This view of inspiration, viz.: that the Bible, though divinely inspired and containing an authoritative revelation of the will of God, yet, by virtue of the human element in it, is liable to contain more or less of error—claims not a few strong points in its favor, among which are these: 1. It is most consistent with the recognized presence of errors in the Bible. 2. It does not necessitate the rather questionable assumption that all these errors are due to copyists, translators, interpolations, etc., and in no case to the original writers. 3. It is the most natural way of interpreting a book that comes to us from men who, in the

absence of positive proof to the contrary, we have a right to suppose are liable to error. 4. It accords best with the entire absence of any claim on the part of the writers themselves of being raised above the possibility of making mistakes. 5. It is favored by analogy in that the Church of God, though it is the organ of the Holy Ghost, is liable to err, and the Gospel minister, though a co-worker with God and guided by his Spirit, is perpetually liable to err. 6. It is a safe rule not to introduce the miraculous except in so far as the Scriptures or the plain facts under consideration render this necessary, and never when the natural can account for all the facts. 7. It accords best with the everywhere present signs of individual peculiarities on the part of the writers, and with the fact that not a little of the Bible is locked up in hopeless obscurity as to its meaning. 8. Why assume that the inspired writers (Moses, David, Solomon, Peter, Mark, etc.,) were prevented from the less serious errors of the head, when the Holy Spirit did not prevent them from more serious moral errors, seeing that an inspired man, if he is to be an infallible teacher of all truth about which he writes, should for a greater reason be morally faultless in his life and character where he teaches by precept? Christ was thus faultless in example as well as in precept. 9. The doctrine that any and every error in the Bible would vitiate its claim to divine inspiration, except as such errors may be accounted for by copyists, interpolators, etc., is much more liable to produce doubt as to any and all divine inspiration than a doctrine which recognizes in the Bible a human element which is liable to err. 10. A doctrine, because it makes high and holy claims of infallibility for the Bible in each and every detail, is not therefore true; nor, on the other hand, if it admits the presence of error (due to man's part in its production), is it therefore to be rejected as unworthy of a divinely inspired book. 11. It furnishes a simple, easy, and natural method of accounting for any errors that may be found in the Bible without imperiling its claims to inspiration, or in any way detracting from the divine elements contained in it. 12. It should be remembered that, while Christ often quoted the Old Testament as an infallible authority, it was generally speaking, the pre-eminently moral and spiritual passages that he quoted; in other words, the passages which, according to both theories, are of divine origin and authority, and he did not, as a rule, quote or refer to those

more human elements of the narrative where errors are to be expected and found.

The actual errors, as a matter of fact, are marvelously few, incomparably fewer, if all things be taken into consideration, than in any other book of like scope in the literature of the world. Moreover, these errors are not of a nature to vitiate in any degree the teachings of the Bible with regard to the great moral facts and truths which it was divinely designed to set forth. And what are these facts and truths? Let the Bible answer for itself. "These (things) are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name." (John 20:31.) "Every scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness: that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work." (2 Tim. 3:16 R. V.) These are moral and spiritual ends. Would it in any way destroy their value in setting forth these ends if the results of modern science (archæology, for example,) should demonstrate beyond a reasonable doubt that the chronology of the Old Testament is quite untrustworthy, and that the figures given cannot be accurate? And would it vitiate the value of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke as inspired narratives concerning the life of our Lord if, as a consequence of such reconstruction of Old Testament chronology, it should be found that the genealogical tables used by Matthew and Luke are erroneous? I confess I should hate to feel that the inspiration and divine authority of the Bible stand or fall with the brief chronology of the Old Testament or with the accuracy of the enormous figures that are given to represent the population and the army of Israel; and as the reconstruction of that chronology would invalidate to a great extent the genealogical tables named, I should hate to feel that the moral and spiritual value of Matthew and Luke as inspired documents stands or falls with the accuracy of those tables. Does the mistake which the sacred narrative represents the inspired Stephen as making (Acts 7:16) in his memorable speech before the Sanhedrin, destroy in any degree the moral and spiritual value of that speech? Surely not; and no more can it destroy the value of Scripture generally, if it be found that its inspired writers—than whom a nobler and more trustworthy succession of authors is not to be found in the literature of the

world—in like manner, through human frailty, made and recorded errors in chronology or geology or astronomy or mental philosophy or history. Literature does not furnish more trustworthy historians and teachers of ethics than the writers of the sacred books. But it must be remembered that it was not science, but moral and spiritual truth, that they were inspired to reveal and record. Herein alone are they to be appealed to as accurate and authoritative exponents of the will of God.

Modern scholarship, then, we may say, recognizes a larger human element in the Bible as a whole than traditional theology did, and in so doing has immensely increased the value of the Bible as literature. But it also recognizes "the Bible within the Bible" and "the Gospel within the Gospel," a most precious element of moral and spiritual truth, the essence of which is found in the revelation of the nature and will of God as the divine Father, and in the stimulus, guidance and help which it gives to sinful men to enable them to get rid of their sins and to become holy and useful,—in the revelation which it makes of the mind and heart of Jesus Christ and in the inspiration which it imparts to every one who receives Him to carry the gospel to those who have it not. Having once distinguished and defined the human and divine elements in the Bible, modern scholarship places an emphasis upon each in its own sphere greater and larger than that which was possible under those forms of traditional theology which so blended the two together as to make them not only inseparable, but indistinguishable. The human becomes more human and the divine more divine. If modern scholarship seems to make less of the written word, the divine-human Book, than traditional theology did, it makes vastly more of "the Word within the Word," of the divine-human Person of Christ, and places a new and larger emphasis upon all the distinctly ethical and evangelical elements in the Bible as expressing the power and purpose of God to save sinners and evangelize the world. If modern scholarship has seemed to some to dwell needlessly upon possible errors that may be found in the Bible, it is only that it may by so doing make freer and more powerful the divine elements in the Bible, its distinctly ethical and evangelical truths, which alone are the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, and to reveal which saving truths was the one great purpose of divine inspiration.

The Task of the College in the South

By S. C. MITCHELL,

Professor of History in Richmond College

Has the college in the South a task in any way distinctive? Growing out of its environment, is there a specific work which it is set to do? If so, is the Southern college altogether conscious of such a mission? A glance at conditions about us reveals the fact that the college has a vantage-ground of rare significance and is rendering unique services to the South in the peculiar difficulties confronting it.

In several definite ways the college is today helping the South. First, the college brought moral re-enforcement to the South in the period of disaster that followed the civil war. Its message of cheer, its serene reliance upon the healing efficacy of truth, its fervent appeal to reason and conscience in the allayment of passion, heartened our people to renewed effort in behalf of progress. Secondly, owing to party solidity in the South, there is an inevitable tendency to the repression of spontaneity in thinking and in the frank discussion of all vital issues that concern the common good. The college has checked this tendency and has, as a rule, stood stoutly for freedom of thought and utterance. Thirdly, owing to State particularism and sectionalism, the South has found difficulty in nationalizing its society and political institutions in accordance with the spirit of the age. The college, by a just interpretation of the signs of the times, has done much to promote the spirit of nationality and to adjust our people to the life of the nation as a whole. Fourthly, owing to the South's transition from strictly agricultural pursuits to industrialism, the college has been called upon to further these lines of development by offering courses in industrial chemistry, electricity, mining and engineering. Fifthly, owing to the absence for a long period of an adequate public school system, the South is now grappling with illiteracy and its resultant evils. In this struggle for universal education, the college has been a pioneer. Its teachers have stumped the State for the common school; its students have energized in behalf of education the communities

to which they have gone; its spirit has been a powerful factor in molding public opinion in the interest of popular enlightenment. Sixthly, owing to the presence of ten million negroes, the South is wrestling with a sociological problem of the most perplexing kind, to the alleviation of which the college is bringing the light of science and the charity of reason devoid of prejudice. Seventhly, owing to class distinctions in its former somewhat feudal type of society and owing to the intensity of denominationalism, the South is going through a process of social unification, in which the college is subtly quickening all the forces that make for genuine democracy. In these seven respects, the task of the college is clear and imperative.

It will be well to speak first of the duties which the college owes to the students within its walls, and afterwards of the duties which the college owes to society at large.

In view of what has been said, it is obligatory upon the college to cultivate in the students the utmost independence and individuality in thinking. No shibboleths are to hold sway. They are to be urged to the closest scrutiny of every fact, whether in nature, in society, or in the State. The college is to make known that there are no closed problems in Southern life and no skeletons in any closet; that intellectual freedom is the one condition of social progress and political sanity; that democracy is merely government by discussion; and that the efficiency of government by the people depends, accordingly, upon universal education and the frank avowal of individual conviction.

Tradition is the dead hand upon the throttle. The other day the Congressional Limited train was flying through Philadelphia at a fierce rate of speed, when the fireman, amazed at the recklessness of the engineer, started toward him, only to find that his dead hand rested upon the throttle. In this mother-age vast forces are in motion, which, unless wisely guided, may bring wreck and ruin. No dead hand must be upon the throttle, whether that dead hand be tradition in religion, party solidity in politics, unreason in the law, feudal ideals in society, or obsolete classicism in the college. The primal duty of the college is to vitalize reason and stimulate it to do its perfect work. In striving to attain this end, the college will bring science to the aid of industrialism; to the narrowing influence of partisan poli-

tics it will bring the breadth of the historical spirit; and to the baffling racial conditions it will bring the guidance of sociology.

It is the high duty of the college to give to its students a just view of society as a whole. It must not confine their thought to the segment of denominationalism or of sectionalism. They must be given the conspectus of the whole circle of society, with its limitless interplay of human forces. I account this right focusing of the student's view of the world as the test of the worth of a Southern college. If the students are rightly orientated, their discernment of the real forces affecting modern life will probably be correct and their influence creative in the attainment of democratic ideals. If, on the other hand, the students are trained to regard habitually the world from the standpoint of the peculiar interests of their social class, of their church, of their State, or of their section, a fatal defect will pervade all their work. They will lack that adjustment to actual conditions which alone can insure lasting success.

The college must imbue its students with the spirit of the publicist; for it is evident from political and racial conditions in the South that we are not to trust entirely to politicians to interpret frankly all the facts in our life and, in consequence, to lead progressively public opinion. For this essential function in making up stable public opinion, we must rely more and more upon the courage and sanity of college-bred men, who, as lawyers, teachers, doctors, preachers, and industrial leaders, will give wise direction to the public mind. In a word, the college must supply in part the lack of aggressive political leadership under present stressful conditions. It is too often true that the politician in the South today has not the necessary detachment of view to attain really to a knowledge of the truth or to judge of the wisdom of courses prompted by conviction and faith. The college can implant in its students the unselfish spirit of the patriot and the judicial candor of the scientific thinker. Does anyone doubt the necessity for the free play of such faculties of the mind in Southern life? The college, moreover, should be the exponent of nationality. This country is one, and it is ever to remain so. Hence the students must be taught to embrace within their affection all the interests of our common country. Prejudice, ignorance and tradition are not to be allowed to defraud them of this their birthright.

It is not enough for the college in the South to do well by the students on its own campus. It owes definite duties to society and the State. It must re-enforce as far as possible all moral and intellectual causes. The insulated college is a thing of the past. The college today must live and move and have its being in the multitude. It does not exist for itself, any more than an arc light exists for itself. It is a vicious notion that a college exists for the advancement of the cultured classes alone, or for the advocacy of certain tenets, or for some coterie, such as its trustees, alumni, or even faculty. Unless the life of a college is vitally related to all of the instinctive needs of society and the deep impulses of the average man, it has been weighed in the balance and found wanting. As the foundations of every college are laid in public confidence, so the success of every college is gauged solely by its services to mankind at large. The college claims no monopoly of truth. Its office is to transmit truth, as the atmosphere diffuses light, in order to make vision possible. Is it not significant that the expert is finding a larger place in our democracy? What is the meaning of the present tendency to govern by commissions? Does it not all signify the increasing importance which the people attach to special knowledge, and their belief in the duty of trained men to labor for the common good?

In periods of passion, in gusts of popular prejudice, the college should be a steadying influence. Wisdom, courage and disinterestedness should enable it to hold a course undisturbed amid these storms of partisan feeling. It is salutary for a community to have a body of men who at every turn interpret the facts in its life in the dry light of truth. We are beginning to learn that the structural force in society is, after all, the idea. To create and to energize the idea of social progress, of national integrity, of industrial justice, and of spiritual power, is the real work of the college. "The true conquests," Napoleon himself was finally brought to confess, "the only conquests which cost no regret, are those achieved over ignorance." In the reconstruction of the South, so distinguished a role has been assigned to college men as to inspire them with the loftiest ideals and to string with energy their purpose to bring our democracy to its highest fruition.

Thomas Nelson Page

By CHARLES W. KENT,

Professor of English Literature in University of Virginia

The new twelve volume edition of the Works of Thomas Nelson Page, recently published by Charles Scribner's Sons, not merely his publishers but, as we learn from the preface, his friends, gives occasion to bring before the readers of the *SOUTH ATLANTIC QUARTERLY* the claims of this author to a wider and more intelligent recognition. The edition is definitive for the present, but fortunately not final, for the author in the prime of life will be expected to fulfill many of the promises here tacitly given of other and perhaps even greater work. The happy designation of this edition is the Plantation Edition, with green cloth indicative of the perennial freshness of these productions and the sign of the spreading tobacco leaves so redolent of the soil of "Old Hanover." The name suggests, too, the life with which in his earliest days the author was best acquainted and the life he still thinks best worth depicting. True to the title, the works themselves breathe a large and free air and root themselves deep in a kindly soil. The breezes are fresh and delightful, even when through the tops of lonely trees in deserted places they seem to sigh for life's losses. Against the brazen conventionality of much of modern life there is a constant protest in the unconventional but primal gentility displayed alike by master and servant, maid and mistress, in the old life that had the heart to be tactful and tranquil and took time to be courteous. No analysis of that life would be of much avail, whether undertaken by those who love it or those who believe its boasted merits exaggerated and unreal, unless it note as its most significant quality the chivalrous spirit of high and sensitive honor and the tender kindliness and human sympathy which were to it as the song to the bird or the pattern to the sunlit web. It is this essential spirit that Page knows and throughout all his plantation pictures reveals with such fidelity as to place himself at the very front of the truest artists that ever essayed to paint this vanishing life.

If to arrange a review of this edition in the order of climax it is

necessary to select any one of these volumes as least original, and for the future least important, the twelfth and last volume might well be chosen. This volume contains the essays and it is certainly no disparagement of their value to place them lowest in a relative ranking of the author's literary output. In these essays he has tried to be directly serviceable and, in a more distinct sense than elsewhere, his aim has been practical rather than artistic, informative rather than merely literary. Of course in "Life in Colonial Virginia" there is that dreamy atmosphere and lingering charm that were inherent in the life depicted, but the purpose is clearly to give an account, historical and essentially accurate, though it may have the additional value of firing the imagination by its note of romance and its thrill of patriotism. The other colonial essay on "Two Old Colonial Places" was written with honorable pride in the homes of the author's immediate ancestors, the Nelsons of Yorktown and the Pages of Rosewell.

Five of the eight essays in this volume deal with the ante-bellum period and three of these five with Virginia. To this extent the essays are local in theme as they must of necessity be in contents and coloring. The Old South is a picturesque phrase, not a mere predicate of time or designation of direction. It has to do with far more than the flight of time or the point of the compass. Forever it will mean in no sectional sense a section and the old will mean for all time the focalized affection with which we apply this word to some revered teacher or some cherished locality. It is thus that the Old South frames itself in the memory and the imagination of this unestranged son of its soil.

"Authorship in the Old South" is apologetic, but soundly and suggestively so. It is the sympathetic study of a critic who could have wished for better things, but who rightly understands why the better things could not then be. This essay will not escape the attention of any bibliographer of this period or any student of a time so splendid in intellectual power and so meagre in literary achievement.

But the three Virginia essays touch directly the three circles of his nearest environment. Social life in Old Virginia was its most peculiar mark and, in a sense, its most persistent and pervasive quality. For all the spirit of hospitality there is hardly today under the embarrassing difficulties of domestic service, any ana-

logue of this old-fashioned open door and unreckoning hospitality, when neither the length of the visit or its frequency seems to have bothered one whit either guest or host. "The Old Virginia Lawyer" stirs the memory of every mature man who was once a boy around a County Court House. The Square with its auctions, its knots of high spirited conversation with its leisurely banter and infinite jest, its public speakers educating the quick witted and unsatisfied "sovereigns" appreciative of every good sally and of quick response to every advantage in debate and every flight in oratory. Within the Court the learned and dignified old-time lawyer engaged in no litigation of his own making but with a high respect for the dignity and honor of his profession illustrated it in his daily demeanor and his high-bred conduct of his cases. It is to this lawyer, like whom under other conditions our author might have become, that he here pays his tribute.

There may be little in the essay on "The Old-Time Negro" that is not better brought out in the author's stories, but to those readers who may see in the stories the liberties of imagination and the unreality of feigned examples this essay will be confirmatory of the author's love for individuals of the type he has elsewhere so lovingly portrayed and with such fidelity. The old negro will never know higher praise than that he deserved the affection and the honor true men of Page's stamp have so generously bestowed upon him.

In this volume is included only one of the author's essays dealing with present conditions. The historian and sociologist of today may well regret this, for Page has been a sage commentator on current events and has spoken with a regnant sanity and virile common sense that have given genuine value to his contributions. The one essay here included is his appeal for a history of the Southern people, a history needed not more because of the unique traits of this people in the former comparative isolation of their semi-national life than because of the fact, pressing itself upon the attention of statesman, churchman and man of affairs, that the conservative South has preserved certain qualities, convictions and standards that may in turn have to preserve this Union.

Page's readers, and their circle is now wide and rapidly expanding, are not all aware that he is a poet. Of course they have not been so dull as not to have caught on many a page of many a

story the poetic touch and sentiment and fancy, but they have probably given little attention to the poetic thought that has assumed the form of conventional verse. Let it be said at the outset, therefore, that he has written more poems in number than did Thompson or Timrod or Poe, and in pages hardly less than any one of these. There is at hand by which to judge him almost as much as Lanier gave us. Yet the mention of these names is hardly apposite or illuminating, for to them poetry was the main medium of expression and the serious devotion of their literary lives. It is surely no accident of arrangement that places these poems of Page in the same volume with his "Pastime Stories." This hints rather at the fact that these poems were pastime productions filling up the chinks of a literary life never lazily lived and at sometimes surprisingly full of larger and more absorbing occupations. But a careful examination of these poems reveals at once and for good and all that they are not mere trifles, mere casual by-products of a fruitful life, but deeply significant of his own heart-life and as deeply imbued with his faith in art and his fidelity to it. The transcript of the notes taken on each one of these poems would interest the technical student, but a few generalizations must here suffice.

Perhaps nowhere in his poems does Page really attain the unquestioned results of creative art, that is to say of art which loosening itself from the local and temporal makes a way for itself in some new realm of thought or with infinite insight brings to light some long dormant truth, or out of a perplexing and baffling chaos brings a harmonious and a new created song. But, to speak academically, he does reach some noteworthy successes in presentative art, that is to say in art which takes the life that now is as a hint to thoughts that now may be expressed and expresses these thoughts that lie out and beyond the limits of experience and are sealed with the personality of the poet. Presentative art bears to representative art crudely the relation of inference from facts to the facts themselves. In his prose Page has shown time and time again his skill in true representation, in his poetry he has been frequently happy in a skill no less artistic in presenting ideas that have no single and fixed prototype.

Where there is so little to find fault with surely the critic need have no hesitancy for personal or other reasons in mentioning

rapidly the blemishes that he may pass to the substantial merits. In poetry so generally good in rhythmical flow and metrical correctness it is just a trifle singular that single lines occur that can only be forced into proper scheme by wrenching verbal accents, distorting logical emphasis, or arbitrarily modifying the phrasing. These exceptions are so rare as to be of little import, but again so rare as to prove that the author might have avoided them altogether. A similar surprise halts us when our poet, who shows distinct mastery of the Italian sonnet form, arbitrarily and of course consciously departs from it by such minor variations as to suggest not intention, but accidental failures. In one he omits the seventh line with its needed rhyme, in another he falls two lines short, and in still another he adds an unnecessary line. Perhaps the two other points that might meet with some disfavor are his unresisted fancy for old-fashioned mythological reference and his inclination to the obsolescent word. But both of these lend a tinge of the archaic to poems that certainly make no pretense to the meretricious jingle, mystic unclearness, or gross modernness of some of our later poetry.

There are but two direct references to poets, one recalling the inventive genius of Irwin Russell who first saw the poetry and pathos of negro life, and the other to the honest but always unsettled doubt of Matthew Arnold. In other words there is no confession as there is no trace of Page's immediate indebtedness to other poets, and hence no temptation to vain comparisons.

The reader will miss in these poems the concreteness of description, the translucent clearness of pictures to which he is so accustomed in the stories. On the contrary he will discover a sort of partiality for a hazy vagueness and a marked tendency to abstractions in the poems of philosophical tone. The figures oftener recall the romanticists of the early eighteenth century than the Stevensonian distinctness of the late nineteenth. These comments, however, hardly touch the essential matter, the spirit and body rather than the dress of the poems. First, of the spirit, that indefinable but informal essence that giveth life.

Toward the past there is a hallowed dreaminess with now and then a mellowing and refining sadness. In this purple haze of poesy the facts of memory loom large. This is particularly true of the memories of childhood of which few authors for grown people have made such refreshing use.

Toward the future the spirit of this poetry is high-thoughted and aspiring. The towering mountain peak and the lofty reaches are in view. They are finite, but the infinite is suggested by the everlasting life and the life-giving virtue of the sea. There is a manly force in the dominant faith, rarely assailed by doubt, and in the perpetual wholesomeness of the high lessons of life.

Toward the present it is the spirit of love: ringing and challenging in his patriotism; tender and gentle in his "home-frame;" hushed and holy toward the dead; and devoted and chastened toward a mother in life's evening. This spirit, for it may well be counted one though triune, finds itself embodied in descriptive poems, in sonnets of facile form, in love-poems of an impersonal sort suggesting a Lovelace or a Carew, and in light poems of the *vers-de-société*. But the poems of greatest value are three—memorial poems, stories in verse, and poetic parables. Reversing this order for brief comment, it may be said that it would be no easy matter to find better specimens of the poetic parable than in the "Needle's Eye," "The Closed Door," and "Convention;" these and others teaching the irreligiousness of religious complacency and conventionality, as well as those primarily secular, reveal high art in compression, in clear pointed and sometimes epigrammatic phrasing and in the moral atmosphere. No one has ever doubted Page's peculiar power as a story teller, but all readers may not have noted this power in his poems. It is, however, apparent first in his ballads, such as "The Dragon of the Seas" with its primal rhythmic swing and its vim and energy of unanalyzed convictions, then in his touching love stories such as "The Bent Monk," then in his dialect poems with sentiment and character so delicately intertwined, and in his mere story-hints, some of which have been used elsewhere. In some of these he shows love not objectively but with genuine personal emotion. This personal note is nowhere so clear and true in his poems as in the memorial poems varying from poetic tributes to deep toned and melancholy dirges.

In general enough has been said to call serious attention to the poetic worth of these poems covering a wide range of theme and treatment and manifesting, if nowhere poetic genius, a highly developed talent, based on knowledge of good poetry, guided by good taste and a sobering sense of the sacredness of song, and

directed to a purpose high and true. There is here no sentimentality, that is "emotions excited for their own sakes," but a manly, unashamed and inspiring sentiment that rings true, with no sign of cracked metal or muffled tongue.

With purpose the work of Page as essayist and poet has been dwelt upon because it is not so certain that his merits in these spheres of literary activity are as generally known or as confidently recognized as in the sphere of novelist and story teller. It may now be clear to the reader—it will be far clearer if he will read these essays and poems—that this work (if not neglected at least not so widely discussed) is thoroughly worthy of honest appreciation and grateful acknowledgment.

In this collection of his works there are only two novels, "Red Rock" and "Gordon Keith," that is, if we accept the forewarning in the preface to "On Newfoundland River" and classify it as a short story of love in spite of its two hundred and eighty-odd pages, filling one complete volume. Of the two novels "Red Rock" is a Reconstruction story with two particular claims to attention, first as a just and acceptable presentation of a shameless chapter in our national history, and second as a story reflecting life and manners in a stressful time. As a contribution to our political history it is dignified and sane, making no appeal to superheated prejudices by resorting to demagogic and claptrap methods that revive the worst memories of past experience and suggest the worst remedies for present ills. It is not merely an advocate's brief, but the evidence—and as such challenging any fair test—of a condition easily established by cumulative evidence of similar kind or other evidence all dissimilar.

But no novelist is willing that his novel should be commended merely as a sociological contribution or an item for the historian's scrap-book. He makes his appeal to the general reader of wholesome interest in human life and perhaps of trained powers of appreciation. To such a reader, particularly if he be not so general as to be incapable of apprehending the specific life of a separate section, this novel will be of interest both in its type of character and its plot as well as in that grace and readiness of style with which the story tells itself. It is surely not serious that the local setting in so far as it is geographical may not be absolutely determined, for its topographical setting, and better, its

true environment of existing conditions and the inherent protest against them is commandingly clear.

Several years passed after this novel before the author sent forth another novel. That work took up Southern life with the close of the Reconstruction era and followed it into our second period of national reunion. This novel throbs with life as does the South it describes, and is overfull, as is also that life, with apparent inconsistencies, crass contrasts and almost incredible situations. But by its overfulness it frees itself at once from the growing list of novels of long and thin veins. The vein here is as full and inexhaustible as the unexploited ore fields recalled by the story. The sensations are not those regularly recurring sensations of the late historical novel that must be prepared for, sprung and then subordinated to the next sensation of greater grotesqueness, until at last some end that might easily have been averted is made to seem inevitable. In a word the sin of too much in incident, characters, and elaboration is readily detected, but this is the rich fault of literary furnishings, not the lapse of authorial poverty. In spite of the ills and evils that are a part of the subject matter of the story, its virility and moral tensity make sound living and sound loving easier among men and women of principle.

It is in all likelihood true that this novel did not reach the extraordinary sale of some of the later fads, but it is just as true that it will probably last after many of its fleetier competitors have run completely beyond the range of our bargaining vision. To what single novel could one turn for a truer representation of the complex and aspiring life of the South after the dire dangers of the reconstruction period had been so far averted as to leave freedom for large planning and hopeful action? In time we shall need another novel into which shall be compacted the rich and promising results of our life since this era of flushed experimentation.

This new novel will trace as the red thread of unity in the trilogy of depression, determination, and deeds, high-minded, honest, and unselfish character—and to such a character no Southern novelist could bring a more loyal fealty or a more ardent love.

Whatever else may be in doubt or debatable it seems to be

settled that as a story teller Page deserves rank among the very best our country has produced. Yet our country has hardly been excelled even by France in this field of literary activity. Substantial agreement has been reached too on the proposition that among his short stories those written at the very outset of his career are his very best. As the last volume of this edition was selected to represent the least significant of his work this first volume may well stand for the climax of his achievement. The last is first and the first is last, for while many others might have written the essays, could any other have written these stories? These short stories in the first volume and in the other volumes exhibiting the high maintenance of his skill represent the very highest exercise of his creative power and the fullest measure of his artistic gifts. But not art for art's sake, but art for truth's sake, is the explanation of the sincerity, the unabashed emotion, and the purifying atmosphere of these gems of the narrator.

The key to the right understanding of all of Page's work is to be found in his personality, that composite quality that includes a manhood of sturdy vigor, a mind of wide culture and keen and catholic sympathies, a moral nature without compromises and apologies and detesting shams, and a native tact of good breeding and inherited traditions. His experience has led him through varying grades of life's fortunes and not along the paths he may once have mapped out for himself. In all of these relations to men and women of many types he has borne himself with inherent dignity but cordial frankness and simple courtesy. His life has taken on a larger and richer humanity and his independence a softer and more gracious gentleness. While thousands who know and praise his writings have never known him, hundreds who know and love both would declare, as he once said of another, that Page is finer than anything he ever wrote.

The Settlement of the Cape Fear

By R. D. W. CONNOR,

Secretary of the North Carolina Historical Commission

After the failure of Sir John Yeamans's colony in 1667 the Cape Fear region fell into disrepute and more than half a century passed before another attempt was made to plant a settlement there. Four causes contributing largely to this delay were: the character of the coast at the mouth of the river; the pirates who sought refuge there in large numbers; the hostility of the Cape Fear Indians; and the closing of the Carolina land offices by the lords proprietors.

The character of the coast could not, of course, be changed, but those who were interested in the development of the Cape Fear region used pen and tongue to improve the reputation which its very name had forever fastened upon it. "It is by most traders in London believed that the coast of this country is very dangerous," wrote Governor Burrington, who was interested in the Cape Fear settlement, "but in reality [it is] not so." The fact remains, however, that this sentence stands as a better testimonial to the governor's zeal than to his love of truth. A different spirit inspired a later son of the Cape Fear* who, with something of an honest pride in the sturdy ruggedness and picturesque bleakness of the famous point, wrote thus eloquently of it: "Looking then to the cape for the idea and reason of its name, we find that it is the southernmost point of Smith's Island, a naked, bleak elbow of sand, jutting far out into the ocean. Immediately in its front are the Frying Pan Shoals pushing out still farther twenty miles to sea. Together they stand for warning and for woe; and together they catch the long majestic roll of the Atlantic as it sweeps through a thousand miles of grandeur and power from the Arctic towards the Gulf. It is the playground of billows and tempests, the kingdom of silence and awe, disturbed by no sound save the sea-gull's shriek and the breakers' roar. Its whole aspect is suggestive not of repose and beauty, but of desolation and terror. Imagination cannot adorn it.

*George Davis.

Romance cannot hallow it. Local pride cannot soften it. There it stands today, bleak and threatening and pitiless, as it stood three hundred years ago, when Greenville and White came near unto death upon its sands. And there it will stand bleak and threatening and pitiless until the earth and sea give up their dead. And as its nature, so its name, is now, always has been, and always will be the Cape of Fear."

But the very danger that repelled traders and adventurers engaged in legitimate enterprises made the Cape Fear a favorite resort for those whose enterprises were plunder and rapine. Behind the sand bars that stretch across the mouth of the river hundreds of pirates rested secure from interference while they leisurely repaired damages and kept a sharp lookout for prey. The period from 1650 to half a century after the departure of Yeamans's colony, John Fiske has aptly called "the golden age of pirates." As late as 1717 it was estimated that as many as 1,500 pirates made their headquarters at New Providence and at Cape Fear. But the next year New Providence was captured and the freebooters driven away. "One of its immediate results, however," as Fiske says, "was to turn the whole remnant of the scoundrels over to the North Carolina coast, where they took their last stand." The names of Blackbeard and Bonnet became household words along the North Carolina coast. The former made his headquarters at Bath, the latter at Cape Fear, and their wild deeds in those waters have furnished materials for stories and traditions that linger yet by village firesides. Finally through the exertions of Governor Spotswood, of Virginia, a force under Captain Maynard attacked Blackbeard in his lair, killed him, and captured and executed his infamous crew; and through the exertions of Governor Johnston, of South Carolina, Captain William Rhett sailed to the Cape Fear, captured Bonnet and carried him to Charleston, where the pirate paid for his crimes "at the tail of a tow." These were decisive blows to piracy along the North Carolina coast and after a few more years the black flags of the buccaneers disappeared from our seas.

The Indians of the Cape Fear "were reckoned the most barbarous of any in the colony." During the Indian wars of 1711-13 they joined the Tuscaroras in a stand against European civilization and the province was compelled to appeal to South Carolina

for aid. Though this was generously furnished it required three years of the combined exertions of both provinces to crush the Tuscaroras and drive them out of North Carolina. Two years later the Yemassee Indians of South Carolina allied all the tribes from the Cape Fear to Florida in hostilities against the whites, and North Carolina then paid her debt to the southern province. Governor Eden sent Colonel Maurice Moore with the North Carolina militia to the Cape Fear, where he struck the blow that finally upset the power of the Indians in that region.

But the struggles of the Carolina settlers with the forces of nature, the freebooters of the sea, and the savages of the wilderness, to recover this splendid region for civilization, were to avail nothing if they were to yield obedience to the orders of the lords proprietors. In their wisdom the proprietors saw fit to resolve "That no more land shall be sold in our province of North Carolina, but such sales of land only as are made here at our board shall be good." But there were men in the province who could not understand the justice of the system by which a few wealthy landowners beyond the sea could prevent their clearing and settling this region in the name of civilization. The more adventurous of them determined to disregard the orders of the proprietors, and about the year 1723 the ring of their axes began to break the long silence of the Cape Fear. They laid out their claims, cleared their fields, and built their cabins in fine disregard of the formalities of law. When Governor Burrington saw that they meant to take up lands without either acquiring titles or paying rents, he decided that the interests of his masters would be served by his giving the one and receiving the other. In his judgment "the jingling of the guinea" would heal the hurt their pride might feel at his disobedience of their orders. At his suggestion, therefore, the assembly petitioned the governor and council that the land offices in Carolina might be reopened, and the governor and council finding officially what they already knew individually, that "sundry persons are already seated on the vacant lands for which purchase money has not been paid nor any rents," granted the assembly's prayer. Good titles thus assured, settlers were not wanting and the wigwams of the red men rapidly gave place to the cabins of the white men.

The two men more instrumental than any others in planting

the Cape Fear settlement were Governor George Burrington and Colonel Maurice Moore. Burrington's claims to this credit were repeatedly asserted by himself and were allowed by contemporaries who bore him no love. The fact that he himself owned five thousand acres of land there only partially explains his interest. He was an ambitious governor, full of pent-up energy, and to whatever task he put his hands, whether leading a riot against Governor Everard, or laying out roads through the wilderness, or clearing the forests for settlers, he went at it with enthusiasm, though not always with good judgment. The grand jury of the province in an address to the king in 1731 bore testimony to the "very great expense and personal trouble" with which he "laid the foundation" of the settlement at Cape Fear. The assembly also in an address to the king declared that Burrington's "indefatigable industry and the hardships he underwent in carrying on the settlement of the Cape Fear deserve our thankful remembrance." Such testimony to his sacred majesty was doubtless very flattering and duly appreciated by his excellency, but Burrington evidently expected something more substantial, for he complained more than once that the only reward he ever received for his losses and hardships "was the thanks of a house of burgesses."

The man who planted the first permanent settlement on the Cape Fear was Colonel Maurice Moore. The Moores were descended from distinguished Irish ancestry, numbering among their forefathers, it is claimed, the ancient kings of Leix.* It is supposed that the great grandfather of Maurice Moore was Roger Moore, who organized the Irish Rebellion of 1641, to whose "generous nature" Hume, in his *History of England*, pays tribute. Maurice Moore came to North Carolina as a captain in the regiment which his brother James Moore led from South Carolina in 1713 to aid in the subjugation of the Tuscarora Indians. At the close of the war he settled in Chowan county, and in 1715, bearing a colonel's commission from Governor Eden, led the North Carolina militia sent to the aid of his native province in the Yemassee War. While he was on this campaign his attention was attracted by the fertility of the lower Cape Fear region and he determined to lead a settlement there. This

* George Davis: Address at University of North Carolina, 1855.

plan he carried into execution sometime prior to the year 1725. Among those who followed him were his two brothers, Roger and Nathaniel, with their families; the family of a deceased brother; a sister, Mrs. Clifford, formerly the wife of Job Howe, and her two sons, Job and Joseph Howe; and his son-in-law, John Porter, with his mother, Mrs. Sarah Porter, the daughter of Major Alexander Lillington. Of them Mr. Davis says: "They were no needy adventurers, driven by necessity—no unlettered boors, ill at ease in the haunts of civilization, and seeking their proper sphere amidst the barbarism of the savages. They were gentlemen of birth and education, bred in the refinements of polished society, and bringing with them ample fortunes, gentle manners, and cultivated minds. Most of them united by the ties of blood, and all by those of friendship, they came as one household, sufficient unto themselves, and reared their family altars in love and peace." After these leaders had cleared the way they were joined by numerous other families from the Albemarle settlement, from South Carolina, from Barbadoes and other islands of the West Indies, from New England, Pennsylvania, and Maryland, and from Europe.

The leaders were the three brothers, Maurice, Roger, and Nathaniel Moore. In a letter to the board of trade in 1732 Governor Burrington refers to them as follows: "About twenty families are settled at Cape Fear from South Carolina, among them three brothers of a noted family whose name is Moore. They are all of the set known there as the Goose Creek faction. These people were always troublesome in that government, and will, without doubt, be so in this. Already I have been told they will expend a great sum of money to get me turned out." Burrington's reference to their conduct in South Carolina is evidently to the fact that James Moore, a fourth and older brother, led the revolt of the people of South Carolina against the rule of the lords proprietors and after their success was elected governor. A century and a quarter later Mr. Davis paid the following tribute to Maurice and Roger Moore: "These brothers," said he, "were not cast in the common mould of men. They were 'of the breed of noble bloods.' Of kingly descent, and proud of their name which brave deeds had made illustrious, they dwelt upon their magnificent estates of Rocky Point and Orton, with much

of the dignity, and something of the state of the ancient feudal barons, surrounded by their sons and kinsmen, who looked up to them for counsel, and were devoted to their will. Proud and stately, somewhat haughty and overbearing perhaps, but honorable, brave, high-minded and generous; they lived for many years the fathers of the Cape Fear, dispensing a noble hospitality to all the worthy, and a terror to the mean and lawless. . . . They possessed the entire respect and confidence of all; and the early books of the register's office of New Hanover county are full of letters of attorney from all sorts of men, giving them an absolute discretion in managing the varied affairs of their many constituents."

The oldest extant grant for land on the Cape Fear is one to Maurice Moore for 1,500 acres of land on the west bank of the river, bearing date June 3, 1725.* From this tract Maurice Moore laid off three hundred and twenty acres as a site for a town and Roger Moore, "to make the said town more regular, added another parcel of land." In order to encourage the growth of the town Maurice Moore donated sites for a church and graveyard, a court house, a market house and other public buildings, and a commons "for the use of the inhabitants of the town." The town was laid off into building lots of one-half acre each, to be sold only to those who would erect good substantial houses. A good politician, Moore made a bid for royal favor for his little town by naming it Brunswick, in honor of the reigning family. But Brunswick never became more than a frontier village of less than four hundred inhabitants, and in the course of a few years yielded, with no good grace, to a younger and more vigorous rival sixteen miles farther up the river.

Life on the Cape Fear was seen at its best not in the town, but on the estates of the planters scattered along the banks of the river and its branches. In the immediate vicinity of Brunswick the most celebrated were: Orton, the finest colonial residence now standing on the Cape Fear, where lived and reigned "Old King" Roger,† and where his body lies buried; Kendal, the home of "Old King" Roger's son, George Moore, whose wives, "with remarkable fidelity and amazing fortitude, presented him every

* Davis: University Address.

† Roger Moore was so called because of his haughty bearing.

spring with a new baby, until the number reached twenty-eight;”* and Lilliput, adjoining Kendal, the residence of Chief Justice Eleazer Allen, the son-in-law of Captain William Rhett, the conqueror of Stede Bonnet. Lilliput afterwards passed for a while into the possession of Sir Thomas Falkland, the great grandson of Oliver Cromwell. In 1734 an Englishman travelling with a party of thirteen others visited the Cape Fear, arriving at Brunswick June 16. “We dined there that afternoon,” he wrote. “Mr. Roger Moore, hearing we were come, was so kind as to send fresh horses for us to come up to his house, which we did, and were kindly received by him; he being the chief gentleman in all Cape Fear. His house is built of brick, and exceeding pleasantly situated about two miles from the town, and about half a mile from the river; though there is a creek comes close up to the door, between two beautiful meadows about three miles length. He has a prospect of the town of Brunswick, and of another beautiful brick house, a building about half a mile from him, belonging to Eleazer Allen, Esq., late speaker of the commons house of assembly, in the province of South Carolina.”

Farther up the river came then and later a succession of celebrated plantations. Forty miles above Brunswick on the east bank of North East River stood Lillington Hall, the home of Alexander Lillington, who led the Cape Fear militia at Moore's Creek Bridge in 1776. On the opposite bank were Stag Park, the Cape Fear estate of Governor Burrington; the Neck and Green Hill, the residences of Governor Samuel and General John Ashe; Moseley Hall, where lived Sampson Moseley, a delegate to the famous Halifax convention of 1776; and Rocky Point, the estate of the father of the Cape Fear, Maurice Moore, described by the English visitor in 1734 as “the finest place in all Cape Fear.” Crossing the river further down “came a series of places, the most historic of which were Castle Haynes, owned by Gen. Hugh Waddell, who is buried there, and The Hermitage, owned by Mr. Burgwin, treasurer of the province before the Revolution, which was one of the most celebrated homes in the Cape Fear country for a hundred years. . . . The great majority of these residences were wooden structures, some of them being large, with wide halls and piazzas, but without any pretence to architectural

* Sprunt: *Tales and Traditions of the Lower Cape*, p. 58.

beauty, and some being one story buildings, spread out over a considerable space. A few were of brick, but none of stone, as there was no building stone within a hundred miles; but all, whether of brick or wood, were comfortable and the seats of unbounded hospitality.”*

Perhaps the best picture of the Cape Fear settlement at the close of its first decade is the pamphlet written and published in London by the English visitor who arrived at Orton in the afternoon of June 16, 1734.† After four pleasant days with “Old King” Roger the party set out on their trip up the Cape Fear under the guidance of Nathaniel Moore. They found the river “wonderfully pleasant, being next to Savannah, the finest on all the continent.” The first day’s trip carried them past “several pretty plantations on both sides” of the river; and the next morning brought them “to a beautiful plantation, belonging to Captain Gabriel [Gabourell], who is a great merchant there, where were two ships, two sloops, and a brigantine, loading with lumber.” The night was agreeably passed at “another plantation belonging to Mr. Roger Moore, called Blue Banks, where he is going to build another very large brick house.” The visitors were astonished at the fertility of the soil. “I am credibly informed,” declared their chronicler, “they have very commonly four-score bushels of corn on an acre of their overflowed land. . . . I must confess I saw the finest corn growing there that I ever saw in my life, as likewise wheat and hemp.” They “met with good entertainment” that night at the home of Captain Gibbs, whose plantation adjoined Blue Banks; and the next day dined with Mr. John Davis, whose house was “built after the Dutch fashion, and made to front both ways, on the river and on the land.” The visitors were delighted with the “beautiful avenue cut through the woods for above two miles, which is a great addition to the house. We left his house about two in the afternoon, and the same evening reached Mr. Nathaniel Moore’s plantation, which is reckoned forty miles from Brunswick. It is likewise a very pleasant place on a bluff upwards of sixty feet high. . . . About three days after my arrival at Mr. Moore’s, there came a sloop of one hundred tons, and upwards, from South Carolina, to be laden with

*Waddell: North Carolina Booklet.

†Georgia Historical Collections, Volume II.

corn, which is sixty miles at least from the bar. . . . There are people settled at least forty miles higher up." The writer's stay at Nathaniel Moore's was prolonged by an attack of "ague and fever" which lingered with him for a month, during which time his companions left him and returned to South Carolina. After his recovery he expressed a desire to see Lake Waccamaw, of which he "had heard so much talk," and was guided to it by his hospitable host. Everything was so new and strange to the young Englishman that he could express his wonder in no language short of superlatives. The mosquitoes which attacked the party in large swarms were the "largest," the deer which ran the woods in great herds were "the largest and fattest," and the lake was the "pleasantest place," he ever saw in his life.

Upon returning from Lake Waccamaw the party proceeded "to take a view of the northeast branch" of the Cape Fear river, where they found the land not so good as on the northwest branch, but the river much more beautiful. "We lay that first night at Newtown, in a small hut, and the next day reached Rocky Point, which is the finest place in all Cape Fear. There are several very worthy gentlemen settled there, particularly Colonel Maurice Moore, Captain Herne, John Swan, Esq., and several others." From Rocky Point the party set out on the return to Brunswick, but the English visitor was delayed at the home of John Davis, about six miles from the town, by a second illness. After a fortnight's struggle with his disease "by the providence of God and the good care of Mrs. Davis" he recovered and took his departure. At Orton he was again handsomely received by "King Roger," from whom he departed with regret. His last experience in the Cape Fear country taught him a lesson which, let us hope, was impressed upon his memory for all time to come, and from which all travellers may profit. Reaching Brunswick about eight o'clock in the morning of August 11, he says: "I set out from thence about nine, and about four miles from thence met my landlord of Lockwood Folly, who was in hopes I would stay at his house that night. About two I arrived there with much difficulty, it being a very hot day and myself very faint and weak, when I called for a dram, and to my great sorrow found not one drop of rum, sugar or lime juice in the house (a pretty place to stay all night indeed) . . . which made me resolve never to trust the country again on a long journey."

Though this account was written when the settlement was less than ten years old, it is manifest that civilization had already reached a high stage of development on the Cape Fear. "The inhabitants of the southern part of this government," wrote Governor Johnston in 1734, "particularly of the two branches of this large river . . . are a very sober and industrious set of people and have made an amazing progress in their improvement since their first settlement, which was about eight years ago." Large tracts of forest lands had been converted into beautiful meadows and cultivated plantations; comfortable, if not elegant, houses dotted the river banks; and two towns had sprung into existence. The forests offered tribute to the lumberman and turpentine distiller and a number of saw mills had been erected; while some of the settlers were employing their slaves chiefly in "making tar and pitch." A brisk trade in lumber, naval stores, and farm products had been established with the other colonies, the West Indies, and even with the mother country, and before the close of the decade the governor declared that the Cape Fear had become "the place of the greatest trade in the whole province." Governor Johnston found by the collector's books at Brunswick that during the year 1734 forty-two vessels sailed loaded from the Cape Fear. The fertility of the soil and the mildness of the climate invited the settlers to agricultural pursuits, and they made numerous experiments to find for what products their lands were best suited. Says Governor Johnston in the letter already quoted: "There are now several of them planting mulberries for raising of raw-silks and cultivating vines for producing wine, in which they seem very expert. Some few are likewise making attempts for oil from the olive and from divers sorts of nuts and seeds which grow almost spontaneously here, for which both the climate and soil seem wonderfully adapted. I heartily wish your lordships could prevail on the legislature to grant some encouragement for the three above named useful commodities, being persuaded they would be of great service to the trade of Great Britain. As this part of Carolina may justly be called a new country it is easy to direct the industry of the inhabitants into what channels you think proper, but if their first attempts to raise such products as England pays ready money for to foreigners are not favored in the beginning, I am afraid they may at length fall into such man-

ufactures as may interfere with and be prejudicial to those at home."

The English visitor of 1734 returning from Lake Waccamaw "to take a view of the northeast branch" of the Cape Fear, spent the "first night at Newtown, in a small hut." With this mention he dismissed the place from his story, but had he returned twenty years later he would doubtless have given it as much as a paragraph in the revised edition. Today a visitor describing the Cape Fear might possibly mention Brunswick because of its historic interest, but Newtown, though masquerading under another name, would be the principal subject of his narrative. The former, in spite of its name, was not popular with the royal governors who threw their influence with the latter; and the rise of Newtown was followed by the decline of Brunswick. In 1731 Governor Burrington in his message to the assembly recommended the passage of an act "for building a town on Cape Fear;" to which the assembly rejoined: "We understand there is a town already established on Cape Fear river called Brunswick in New Hanover precinct in respect to one of the titles of the illustrious House of Hanover, and we are informed it is likely to be a flourishing place by reason of its excellent situation for the trade of those parts." The assembly declined, therefore, to follow the recommendation of the governor, but their refusal could not prevent the growth of a rival to Brunswick. The exposed situation of Brunswick harbor and the excellent harbor farther up the river were more potent influences than the favor of the royal governors or the hostility of the assembly, and the new town was established without the one and in spite of the other. It was laid off on lands originally owned by John Watson, just below the confluence of the two branches of Cape Fear river, sixteen miles above Brunswick. In the spring of 1733 Watson sold fifty acres in the center of his tract to Michael Higgines and Joshua Granger; and the remainder below this tract he sold to James Wimble, mariner. These four—Watson, Higgines, Granger and Wimble—then "entered into an agreement to lay out part of the said tract of land into lots and streets for a town." Two streets were accordingly surveyed and called Front and Market, names they still bear, while the town, for the lack of a better name, was called Newtown, or Newton.

From the first Brunswick regarded Newtown as an up-start to

be suppressed rather than encouraged. Rivalry originating in commercial competition was soon enhanced by a struggle for political supremacy. The chief factor in this struggle was Gabriel Johnston, a hard-headed Scotchman, who, in 1734, succeeded George Burrington as governor. Johnston received his first welcome to the province at Brunswick, where he arrived October 27, and where, seven days later, at the court house in the presence of Robert Halton, Eleazer Allen, and Roger Moore, members of the council, he opened his commission and took the oath of office. The little borough doubtless thought itself happy in being permitted to extend the first welcome to his sacred majesty's governor and many of the citizens donned their best clothes to see their neighbor, William Maxwell, temporary clerk of the council, administer the oath of office to his excellency. It was brief and simple ceremony, but it boded no good to Brunswick. The wily speculators who were interested in the development of Newtown gained the governor's ear and poisoned his mind against Brunswick with tales of agues and fevers to which the town was subject, said they, in addition to its other disadvantages. How far the governor was influenced by these reasons, and how far by the fact that he owned lands in the vicinity of Newtown, it is impossible to say; we know only that he soon became one of the most ardent champions of the latter and used not only his personal influence, but also his official authority, to make it the social, commercial, and political center of the rapidly growing province. Within less than six months after his arrival he had established a court of exchequer, opened a land office, convened the court of oyer and terminer, and held his council meetings at Newtown. A still severer blow was delivered at Brunswick when he appointed James Murray naval officer and collector of the port and ordered him to remove the office from Brunswick to Newtown. Encouraged by his excellency's favor the inhabitants of the younger town had, in March, 1735, petitioned the governor and council for incorporation; but the prayer was not granted because the incorporation of a town required an act of the general assembly. To the assembly, therefore, Newtown appealed, and as a compliment to the governor asked for incorporation under the name of Wilmington, in honor of Johnston's patron, Spencer Compton, Earl of Wilmington, and afterwards prime

minister of England. The failure of this appeal did not discourage the governor, but rather stimulated his zeal, since victory would now carry with it a merited honor to his distinguished patron.

The final struggle came in the assembly that met at New Bern February 5, 1740. A petition signed by one hundred and eight of the inhabitants of New Hanover county—"the grand panel summoned for the court of oyer and terminer"—was presented, "setting forth that by an act passed in the year 1729 the county courts, election of burgesses, vestrymen, the court house and gaol, are appointed at Brunswick, a place remote, the river difficult, broad, and dangerous of access for the greatest part of the inhabitants of said county; and that Newton in said county is more convenient for the purposes aforesaid; that at the last assembly it was thought Newton was the most proper place for the circuit courts of New Hanover, Bladen, and Onslow counties, that it will be necessary to have a court house and gaol there, and if those may serve for the county it will be saving a considerable charge for the county; praying this house to take the premises into consideration and grant relief." Everybody, of course, understood the nature of the relief desired, and John Montgomery, of Tyrrell, and William Bartram, of Bladen, were appointed to "bring in a bill for an act pursuant to the said petition." Half an hour later, according to the journal, "Mr. Bartram produced to this house a bill for an act erecting the village called Newtown in New Hanover county into a town and township by the name of Wilmington and for regulating and ascertaining the bounds thereof." The passage of this bill meant death to all the hopes and aspirations of Brunswick. Under its provisions Brunswick would be compelled to surrender finally to Wilmington the county court, the offices of the county officers, and, worst of all, the office of the naval officer and collector of the port. All elections of delegates to the assembly, vestrymen, and other public officials, would be removed from Brunswick to Wilmington. But perhaps no feature of the bill was more galling to the pride of Brunswick than that which required all the taxes that had been levied by the county court of New Hanover "towards building a court house and gaol in the town of Brunswick for the said county," to be applied "towards finishing and

completing the court house already erected in the town of Wilmington and towards building a gaol in the said town." The partisans of Brunswick do not seem to have made an effort to prevent the passage of the bill through the lower house, evidently expecting to defeat it in the upper house. This house was composed of only eight members, four of whom were Brunswickers and four followers of the governor. When the Wilmington bill came before them, therefore, William Smith, the president, Robert Halton, Matthew Rowan, and James Murray voted for it; Nathaniel Rice, Eleazer Allen, Edward Moseley, and Roger Moore against it. If the opponents of the bill allowed themselves to indulge a feeling of exultation it was but momentary, for a startling announcement from the president warned them that the fight was not yet won and brought them to their feet with vigorous protests. Smith declared that as president he had a right to break the tie which his vote as a member had made, and in the face of the strenuous opposition of the Brunswickers cast his vote a second time for the bill. Rice, Allen, Moseley, and Moore entered their protest on the journal in no very uncertain terms, but it availed nothing with Gabriel Johnston, who, in the presence of both houses, gave his assent to the bill and re-baptized Newtown with the name of Wilmington.

His pleasure at the result was expressed in a manner characteristic of a royal governor. The assembly, he wrote to the board of trade, "behaved with decency and parted in a very good humor (a thing not very common here) after passing some laws. At present I shall only take notice of one, which is an act to erect a village called Newtown on Cape Fear River into a township by the name of Wilmington. The situation of this town is mighty convenient, being at the meeting of the two great branches of Cape Fear River, its road capable of receiving vessels of great burden and extremely safe in the most violent storms and there is a most easy access to it from the remotest heads of the river by the smallest vessels. I have always looked upon the want of a town with a convenient port as one of the greatest obstacles to the improvement of the trade of this country and the polishing its inhabitants. I hope this impediment is now removed, and don't despair in a few years to prevail on the assembly to build offices and other places fit for the dispatch of public business, the

want of which has been a great clog to all affairs ever since I came here." Had Governor Johnston been better acquainted with the people of his province he would have omitted this last sentence. More than one of his numerous successors, even among those chosen by the people themselves, has found it no easy task to persuade North Carolina assemblies "to build offices and other places fit for the dispatch of public business," though the want of them has always been a "great clog" to public affairs; and the only governor who ever succeeded has received as his only reward a century and a quarter of unjust and unmerited censure. It is hardly necessary to add that this was not Gabriel Johnston.

Brunswick did not accept defeat gracefully; nor did Wilmington bear the honors of victory magnanimously. The feelings aroused by the fight and the manner in which it was won not only poisoned their commercial and political relations, but embittered their social and religious intercourse. This hostility made it necessary to divide the county into two parishes—St. James, embracing the territory on the east side of the river, and St. Phillips, embracing that on the west side. But this division did not help matters much at first, as there was only one minister, and he does not seem to have had the inexhaustible amount of tact that was necessary to deal with the situation. Says he: "A missionary in this river has a most difficult part to act, for by obliging one of the towns, he must, of course disoblige the other, each of them opposing the other to the utmost of their power. Notwithstanding the majority of the present vestry at Wilmington are professed dissenters and endeavored by all ways and means to provoke me to leave that place, yet they cannot endure my settlement at Brunswick. While I was their minister they were offended at my officiating sometimes at St. Phillips, and now to exasperate that vestry against me, they insist on my officiating frequently among them."

But Brunswick struggled in vain against the Wilmington tide; the latter town had an unconquerable ally in nature and Brunswick in time was forced to give up the fight. The royal governors were frequently able to divide the people of the province on public questions, but none of them possessed the tact to keep them so; their arbitrary proceedings which endangered the welfare and liberties of the whole would always close the breeches which their

petty politics had created and drive factions together in resistance to general oppression. So Brunswick and Wilmington found their factional quarrels would, if continued, result in injury to both; and in the course of a few years when their animosities had been mellowed by time, when the actors in the early struggle were dead, and when danger from a common enemy threatened the existence of both, their petty differences were buried and forgotten and the two towns stood side by side in the great war for freedom. This union was never broken, for the ties formed during those days of peril proved stronger than ever their differences had been, and Brunswick, abandoning the old site, united fortunes with Wilmington.

Edwin Lawrence Godkin: A Great American Editor*

BY OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD,
Of the New York Evening Post

It is eminently proper that the task of preparing an adequate memoir of Edwin Lawrence Godkin, the most brilliant of the editors of the New York *Evening Post*, should have fallen into the hands of a successor in that editorial chair. But Mr. Rollo Ogden has, with characteristic modesty, written himself down merely as the editor of the two volume life of Mr. Godkin just issued by The Macmillan Company. He was quick to see that nothing could be said about Mr. Godkin that would be more interesting than the words of the man himself, and so he has refrained as much as possible from criticism or laudation or characterization, and let Mr. Godkin tell the story of his own life by giving extracts from his correspondence and writings. It is not often that a biographer is thus ready to subordinate himself; more often he is as eager to obtrude his own views of his subject as some dinner chairmen are ready to burst into oratory whenever they rise to their feet to introduce a speaker. Nor is it always possible to thus portray adequately the man whose story is to be told. But in this case the experiment has succeeded admirably. Mr. Ogden has given us a book so well put together as to record Mr. Godkin's many-sidedness, his patriotic service to his adopted country and the brilliancy of his pen, while furnishing the most delightful and entertaining reading. Even one tolerably familiar with Mr. Godkin's life and writings must find the volumes difficult to lay aside, and put down they cannot be without regret that there are not more of them. The later period of Mr. Godkin's life might well have received more attention; his attitude towards the war with Spain would seem, for instance, to have been well worth treatment, for his steadfast and consistent opposition to that war was altogether one of the finest and bravest passages in a brave man's life.

* *Life and Letters of Edwin Lawrence Godkin*. Edited by Rollo Ogden. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1907, 2 vols.

Like many another writer of high ideals and liberal views it was rarely Mr. Godkin's fate to be on the popular side of a question. He was of that minority which, although ever defeated, is ever successful by moulding public opinion, by raising the standards of politics and morals and then watching the people gradually adopt those same standards for which they first denounced or ridiculed the bearers. This is the true reward of the independent journalist and Mr. Godkin had it in full measure despite many disappointments of his latter years. He lived to see the success of that reform of the civil service which he was one of the first to advocate. When he took up the cudgels against Tammany he stood almost alone among journalists, and when that band of plunderers suffered its severe defeat of 1894 many of New York's foremost men and women gave the credit to Mr. Godkin and united in making a gift to him which expressed their belief and their gratitude in a tangible way. Before Mr. Godkin's death practically all of the press of New York was anti-Tammany. More than that, it had become unfashionable among journalists to sneer at the independent newspaper or, broadly speaking, to be else than independent. The thick-and-thin partisan paper is hardly to be found today, at least not in New York. It no longer pays, and this is true though the *Tribune* still survives; but even the *Tribune* has been known to bolt a regular Republican ticket. When one considers the violence of the denunciation of Mr. Godkin, George William Curtis, and the other Mugwumps who made bolting fashionable in 1884, it is obvious that the "world do move," even if we fail often to stop long enough to note its progress.

If still another example of the way the country has grown up to Mr. Godkin's teachings were needed, we might cite the changed public attitude towards Great Britain. Even a youth can remember when the twisting of the British Lion's tail was a familiar pastime of every buncombe statesman in Washington from Lodge down—or up. Mr. Godkin's pleas for friendship between the two countries, for a sane treatment of the points at issue, led to his being denounced right and left as a foreigner who ought to go back to England since this country was not good enough for him. The charge that Cobden Club gold was behind the *Evening Post* and other Free Trade or Tariff Reform newspapers was one

the high protective organs delighted in. When Godkin felt himself compelled to oppose President Cleveland's Venezuelan Message the assaults upon him broke out anew. To many his stand on this question was proof positive that he was at heart an Anglo-maniac. If Mr. Godkin were writing today, he would find that the language of good manners and good will which he used towards England is now the common property of all journalists. We no longer accuse the British of secretly planning to sail into New York Harbor and take the sub-treasury before morning, but have transferred to Germany and Japan our insinuations and our accusations. To stand up for England is the popular thing; no editor would think of criticising Mr. Godkin now for applauding such of her institutions and policies as appealed to him.

That Mr. Godkin was quite aware that he would have to face aspersion of his motives and sincerity appears in Mr. Ogden's *Life*. When attacks of some dissatisfied stockholders were being made upon Mr. Godkin in 1866, he wrote to James Russell Lowell:

"I am made all the more sensitive in this matter because the disadvantages of being a stranger are great enough without having added to them the disadvantage of being denounced as a knave."

From Mr. Bowles, of the *Springfield Republican*, Mr. Godkin learned that the subject was discussed at a dinner party in Boston, at which it was said that

"'An Englishman might be fit for the kingdom of heaven, but not to edit an American newspaper.' I said the joke was good, but would have more point if the most successful paper in America, in the common low sense of the word, and that whose influence has received the strongest acknowledgment from the public and from politicians, had not been conducted by a blackguard Scotchman."

As a matter of fact, throughout the Civil War Mr. Godkin rendered the most valuable service to his adopted country. His letters to the *Daily News* during that period are today models for correspondents the world over for their style, their intelligence and their evident mastery of the subjects which he treated; and not even the most jealous American can assert that anyone could have fought better for the cause of the North than did Mr. Godkin. It was in this wise that he wrote of Farragut:

"I cannot help recommending Farragut to the attention of those gentlemen in England who seem now to us here so badly off for naval

heroes on whom to expend their admiration. He has, I believe, never in his life attacked an unarmed enemy. He has never, I believe, burnt a merchantman, and thus brought ruin on unoffending non-combatants. He has no 'chronometers' in his cabin that have not been fought for or paid for. He has never avoided a fight when the chance of one was proffered him, and has never fought except against superior force. He has three times maintained with honor and success the cause of the old wooden ships, so dear to the hearts of Englishmen, against rams, iron-clads, and earthworks, rifled guns and every other improved engine of destruction, and has on each occasion performed the most difficult of all naval exploits, in forcing the passage of narrow and obstructed channels under the fire of heavy armed forts at short range; and all this at an age when most men pass their time in their easy-chairs. How the soul of such a man must have beaten against the bars through the forty years of peace, of cruising on stations, of watching slave-traders, of fretting monotony in navy yards, which have rolled over his head! How much bitterness must be infused into the enjoyment of his present triumphs by the reflection that the opportunity of achieving them has come so late!"

Recalling this war correspondence Mr. Godkin wrote on the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the *Daily News* :

"No war since men began to fight has ever been so fully recorded. But no record or monument can give any one who did not live through it an adequate notion of the indomitable courage with which it was prosecuted, and of the determination never to submit or yield which sustained the Government. It was, more than any other, the heroic age of the American Commonwealth. The Revolution of 1776 was carried to a successful issue mainly through the perseverance of a few leading men; the war of 1861 was essentially a popular rising which carried the leaders forward often in spite of themselves."

Of Mr. Godkin's own share in this reporting Mr. J. E. Cairnes, the great English economist, wrote to him in 1865:

"Allow me to take this opportunity of expressing my sense of the high value of your correspondence in the *Daily News* during the last four years. I have read it from the first, scarcely, I think, omitting a letter, with constantly increasing confidence in the accuracy of your knowledge and the soundness of your judgment."

But even these quotations do not convey the delight, the pleasure and the humor of Mr. Godkin's letters, with which a large part of the second volume of his *Life* is filled. Mr. Ogden gives a number of examples of his wit, so often unconscious; and of his unexpected turns of phrase. He once wrote, "If I were to come into possession of the estate which the *rightful* owner has so long withheld from me, I would certainly move to Cambridge." Writ-

ing of Charles Sumner he said, "He works his adjectives so hard that if they ever catch him alone they will murder him." Even when despondent his humor never failed him. Once he exclaimed, "What an infernal old world it is. Nobody has a good time in it but Satan, and the Catholics worry even him with holy water." In similar strain he once wrote of some opponents: "For them Satan is waiting—not anxiously, for he knows well he will get them eventually—nor yet eagerly, for he, of course, desires their measure of iniquity to be as full as possible." Mr. Godkin's ability to visualize a phrase or figure of speech was unusual indeed. Thus when it was alleged that a prominent Wall Street money lender was "laying down on his privileges" Mr. Godkin instantly added, "Anyhow if he did not lay down he was making all the movements of a dog before he does."

So far as the South is concerned, it early interested Mr. Godkin. Indeed, it was the first portion of the United States that came under his observation. A month after he had arrived in New York he went South on a double mission, to send information to Neill Brothers, cotton merchants, and travel letters to the *London Daily News*. He went from New York to Wilmington, thence to Montgomery and Selma, from there to Vicksburg and New Orleans. Coming as he did fresh from Europe, he was wholly without prejudices against the South or Southerners, although as a pupil of John Stuart Mill and a believer in genuinely democratic institutions he was opposed to slavery in principle. Young as he was, the title of man of the world belonged to him; he had seen the hardships of life and horrors of war. Primitive conditions in the Near East had not staggered him, but he found American slavery revolting not merely in its effect upon the negro, but also upon the white man. Riding through the country on horse-back as he did, he had the same extraordinary opportunity for careful observation which had been Frederick Law Olmsted's a couple of years earlier, and his impressions are of great historical value as a complete confirmation of the New Yorker's invaluable books, which ought to be in the hands of every Southern youth who would know slavery as it was—not as it exists in the novels of Page and others. In these letters Mr. Godkin's great talent for description and comment is so clearly shown that three passages from the letters given by Mr. Ogden are worth reprinting here in full for the style alone.

Of the poor whites he encountered on his rides in Mississippi he wrote as follows to the *Daily News*:

"The population is scanty; and the houses, such as they are, for the most part are inhabited by that most wretched, most cadaverous, most thinly clad, most lean, most haggard, most woe-begone, forlorn, hopeless, God-forsaken-looking-portion of the human race, the poor niggerless whites of the slave States. I have seen many varieties of the genus *homo*, and many varieties of the misery to which he is at all times liable, but I think I have never seen men in whom hope, energy, and courage, to all outward appearance, seemed so utterly extinguished as in these. Their attenuated frames, hollow cheeks, fireless, expressionless eyes, drawing, feeble accents, spiritless movements, and ghastly complexion, spoke either of a race degenerated beyond redemption or of the extremity of physical misery. I never met one of them without going away with the feeling that I had just seen a man on whom either famine or fever had done its worst. Their position is certainly most demoralizing and disheartening. They are despised alike by negroes and planters. They manage to draw a wretched subsistence from a patch of Indian corn round their log cabins, but they will not work for others, as this would put them on a level with the slaves. Those who can muster up enough money for the journey invariably make their escape to the Western wilds; but a great number, of course, are compelled to stand their ground and get along as best they can. Society, they have none. There is amongst them none of the hearty enjoyments of existence; none of the pleasures, frivolities, gayeties of peasant life in all European countries. They are generally far removed from all neighbors of their own rank; they cannot associate with negroes. They chew, spit, 'loaf,' and die. Melancholy, taciturn, surly, and sickly. With these passing remarks let me drop the curtain on them. They are an unpleasing vision. The world has for years been ringing with the wrongs and miseries of the Turkish *rayah* and the Irish peasant. I have seen a good deal of both. In physical comfort the *rayah* occupies a position of which 'poor whites' hardly dream; in lightness of heart, in the joys of the mind, the Irish peasant is a king in comparison."

Part of his Louisiana trip he thus described:

"Two miles from Mr. H—'s I descended from the dry ground into the swamp, which lay below shrouded in Stygian gloom and flooded in its whole extent. The bayou which bounded it on my side was no longer fordable. The muddy water had risen over the banks and rushed silently downward through hoary trunks till it was lost under overhanging garlands of Spanish moss. Eternal twilight reigns in these lugubrious wastes, and today it had darkened down almost into night. The great sheets of lightning that, ever and anon, threw their glare down through the trees only revealed more awfully the desolation of the scene. I had passed the last house a mile and a half farther back; there was not

another for twelve miles in front, and, in spite of all reasoning and all efforts, I spurred into the stream under a load of despondency more easy to account for than describe. In two yards my horse got his fore feet into a hole and fell headlong, and we scrambled out in a pitiable plight, but not any wetter than before the catastrophe occurred. During the remaining ten miles, as the road was in a perfect quagmire, I had to grope my way through the trees, over fallen trunks, through roots, brushwood, and wild vines, mud-covered, face and hands bloody, and clothes in rags, and all the while wading through from two to three feet of water, besides swimming two more bayoux. Half-way I fell in with an emigrant party on their way to Texas. Their mules had sunk in the mud; one of them bid fair to remain there, as he had only his neck above the surface and his owner had apparently exhausted all his resources in the endeavor to extricate him. The wagons were already embedded as far as the axles. The women of the party, lightly clad in cotton, had walked for four miles knee-deep in water through the brake, exposed to the pitiless pelting of the storm, and were now crouching, forlorn and woe-begone, under shelter of a tree. The men, apparently despairing of any immediate deliverance from their *embarras*, were making feeble attempts to light a fire. Promethean fire would hardly have remained alight under such a rain as that.

"'Colonel' (brevet rank given by courtesy in these parts to any decent-looking individual to whom one wishes to be civil), said one of them, looking up as I rode past, 'this is the gate of hell, ain't it?'

"'I'm afraid the gate of hell is easier to get through than this,' I said.

"(A pause—reflects). 'Hum—I reckon you're right.'

"The hardships the negroes go through who are attached to these emigrant parties baffle description. In wet weather they often do not get in shelter of a house for a fortnight at a time or perhaps a chance of drying their clothes. They trudge on foot all day through mud and thicket, without rest or respite. The white man is generally either mounted on horseback or takes occasional rides in the wagons. In addition to this, he is stimulated by hope, or affection or self-interest. We all know what an influence *morale* has in supporting men under physical fatigue, how the spirit spurs on the body to almost incredible exertions when great gain is in prospect or great interests are at stake. We know how much more hardship a leader can bear up under in a forced march than the private soldier, in whose ear ambition whispers no golden tale, and before whose wearied eye glory conjures up no golden visions. But the meanest Russian mujik that ever toiled along the steppes of Perekop, to find a nameless grave on Mount Sapoune, carried within him a thousand stimuli to patience and endurance in his loyalty, his religion, his patriotism, his *esprit de corps*, which the bands of negroes who yearly journey westward in the train of their owners never know and never feel. Hundreds, aye, thousands of miles of swamp and forest are traversed by these weary wayfarers without their knowing or caring why, urged on by the whip and in the full assurance that no change of place

can bring any change to them. East or west, in Alabama or Texas, hard work, coarse food, merciless floggings are all that await them and all they can look to. I have never passed them—staggering along in the rear of the wagons at the close of a long day's march, the weakest furthest in the rear, the strongest already utterly spent—without wondering how Christendom, which, eight centuries ago, rose in arms for a sentiment, can so long look calmly on at so foul and monstrous a wrong as this American slavery."

As to the attitude of the South towards England, Mr. Godkin described it in the following happy passage:

"There is in the South, nevertheless, I think, a larger amount of kindly feeling towards England than in the North, except amongst the cultivated portion of the New Englanders. There immigrates yearly into the Northern States a large mass of England-haters, Irish and foreign, who growl, howl and lie against Great Britain as long as their lungs last them. Very few if any of that class make their way into slave territory. The old race, as it landed in Virginia and Carolina, is here still tolerably pure from foreign adulteration and looks back to the mother-country still with much pride and a good deal of affection. Every name one hears is a good old English name, and I have not met an honest farmer yet who was not gratified to learn that his cognomen was a common one on the other side of the water, and who was not visibly delighted to be able to tell which of his ancestors it was who first set foot on the soil of the New World, English born and English bred. And, moreover, I have sat at no fireside without being assured by a thousand tokens that I was all the more welcome for having so lately quitted the mother country."

If Mr. Godkin was a severe critic of the South at that time, it was given to him later to be its champion during reconstruction days. Then in the *Nation* he opposed the Federal Government's policy, urged the withdrawal of the United States troops, was on friendly terms with Wade Hampton and others, championed the enfranchisement of the disfranchised Confederates and their return to Congress. For all this and much more valuable service he and the *Nation* received many letters of thanks from Southern men—much as they might disagree with him in his attitude toward the negroes. And when it came to the latter-day proposal for a force bill, no journal in the entire country fought harder against it or labored more earnestly or with greater success to defeat it than the *Evening Post*. How quick Mr. Godkin was to praise Southern leaders of merit appears, too, from his characterization of "Stonewall" Jackson in 1864, when contemporary Northern

opinion was not so favorable to that great soldier as it is today. From this we quote again:

"He was the right arm of the Confederacy. Davis and Lee probably plan and scheme much better than he, for his force did not lie so much in his head as in his heart; but when the moment came for execution he towered head and shoulders above everybody else. His will was so strong that nothing was impossible to him; and his heart was so thoroughly in the cause that, possible or impossible, he recoiled from nothing that its success seemed to require. I have spoken at such length about him because I consider his career the most extraordinary phenomenon of this extraordinary war.

"Pure, honest, simple-minded, unselfish, and brave, his death is a loss to the whole of America, for, whatever be the result of this war, the United States will enjoy the honor of having bred and educated him. And the Puritanism which made him what he was, in which he lived and gloried, was a hardy Northern plant and had none of the soft odor of the tropics about it. He was a soldier of the old Cromwellian type, the most perfect that has appeared in our times, and most likely the last we shall ever see. And in these days, when it is becoming almost ridiculous to believe strongly and completely in anything, or to be in earnest about anything, a man of this mould is not to be lightly passed by, even if he had not a tithe of Jackson's titles to solid enduring fame."

It has often been said to the writer, "What a great editor Mr. Godkin was!" To this the reply has invariably been, "No, Mr. Godkin was probably the greatest editorial writer the country has ever seen, but he was not a great editor in so far as that word covers the administration of a newspaper." It was with the editorial page that Mr. Godkin was primarily concerned. Of course in the early days of the *Nation* he was compelled to give considerable attention to the business side. Yet the vicissitudes of the *Nation* were very great. The first *Nation* company, which started off with \$100,000 capital, a very large sum for such ventures in 1865, failed within the first year, and the weekly was in a moribund condition when consolidated with the *Evening Post* in 1881. Mr. Godkin welcomed the amalgamation, not only because it gave him the *Evening Post* to work with, but because it relieved him from any responsibility for the business side. Thereafter he concerned himself singularly little with the prosperity of the paper and the extent of its circulation. These matters he left entirely to others. Beyond a general inquiry occasionally as to whether the paper was or was not prosperous, he took practically no interest in its financial progress. He not

only refused absolutely, and with rare wisdom, to make any concessions of principle to the business office of the *Evening Post*, but even declined to encourage a perfectly correct coöperation between the two departments, which might often have resulted in the paper's material advance. In latter years he was also very little interested in the young men of the staff, to many of whom he was known only by sight. He did insist upon the upholding of the standards of the paper in the matter of typography and the English used in all departments, but he was not a newspaper man in the sense that he was concerned with the news value of the *Evening Post*. With the future of the paper after his retirement from it he also never concerned himself. Having an unusually able staff of editorial writers around him, it did not matter to him that they were growing old with himself, and that there must be extensive changes in the natural order of events. While he did more than any other editor of the *Evening Post* to make that newspaper one of New York's institutions, he did not, on the other hand, develop the institutional spirit within the office. But if the younger men of the staff were excluded from the enjoyment of his delightful wit and satire, and positive genius for characterization, the editorial staff enjoyed them to the brim. The daily editorial council, over which he presided, was in itself an inspiration; and if those who believed him to be sour and pessimistic could but once have had the privilege of attending this gathering, they would speedily have realized how loyal to American life Mr. Godkin was, and how thoroughly he believed in the unlimited possibilities of this Republic. He used to repeat with the greatest enjoyment a story that once went the rounds of the press, to the effect that when he called his staff together for the morning consultation, he opened the proceedings by making them sing "God save the Queen." But this story amused the staff even more, because they had daily and hourly evidence of Mr. Godkin's desire to be of service to the United States and to keep it true to its highest and best ideals. No other thought or motive ever dictated a single line of his writing. His own journalistic sailing orders he phrased in a letter he wrote to a friend on May 9, 1897, when he said:

"I beg of you to use what influence you have now, not for the promotion any longer of the virtues of pity, humanity, sympathy, generosity, and so forth—for of these we have an abundance—but for the promotion of the habit of thinking clearly about politics, of looking disagreeable facts sternly in the face, of legislating not as if men were lumps of clay that a Congressional Committee can fashion at its pleasure, but for men as we find them with their passions, prejudices, hates, loves, and defects of all sorts. We are saying this every day to the English about the Irish; ought we not apply the lesson to the work before us?"

Herein is explained the whole theory upon which he worked.

To the end of his career Mr. Godkin's humor never left him. It is undeniable that in later years he lost something of his faith in the ultimate success of democratic institutions. The war with Spain, the conquest of the Philippines, the set-backs to divers dear causes because of the degeneracy of the Democratic party,—these and other things tried him sorely, and as ill health came steadily upon him he lacked the physical vigor to shake off their depressing effect. Yet to those who were close to him nothing was harder to bear than the allegations of cynicism and pessimism which were hurled at him in the last years of his life. To them the charge was as preposterous as the earlier charges that he was at heart a British spy and took Cobden Club gold. As a matter of fact, it was always so hard for his opponents to make personal insinuations against him that they snapped at anything that offered itself. Mr. Godkin was not only unpurchasable in the ordinary sense, but he was unapproachable along the lines which are often successful with other journalists whose characters have been less well grounded. Thus, he never sought or accepted a paid political office, but showed his constructive abilities while acting with Everett P. Wheeler and E. Randolph Robinson as Civil Service Commissioner of New York City. They reorganized the entire service with marked and lasting success, and throughout Mr. Godkin showed that he possessed the constructive ability characteristic of the statesman. Mr. Godkin was also not to be influenced by financial friendships or social attentions. Social ambitions he had none. Enjoying as he did the friendship of the men who stood intellectually foremost in his time, he delighted to ridicule the pretensions of the vulgar crowd who, by reason of wealth or ancient lineage, strove to make themselves an aristocracy in a democratic community.

From friends of the type of Lowell, the Jameses, Howells, George William Curtis, Carl Schurz and a host of others, Mr. Godkin received ample recognition for his devoted civic labors in incessant battling as austere moralist and idealistic reformer. Personal tributes of all kinds came to him during his lifetime. One of the best of them is that of Professor William James, of Harvard, since it sums up in a sentence the range of Mr. Godkin's influence:

"To my generation, his was certainly the towering influence in all thought concerning public affairs, and indirectly his influence has certainly been more pervasive than that of any other writer of the generation, for he influenced other writers who never quoted him, and determined the whole current of discussion."

To this it need only be added that no one ever read a word of Mr. Godkin's which did not make for good and for the uplifting of mankind. To no narrow, or selfish, or bigoted, or prejudiced political doctrine or sentiment did he ever lend the weight of his unsurpassed editorial pen.

Some Recent Notable Books on Education

By EDWIN MIMS,

Professor of English Literature in Trinity College

Dean Briggs, of Harvard, closes the preface to his excellent book entitled "School, College, and Character" with the significant words: "One thing is certain: he who writes nonsense about education is in excellent company." And still they write: besides reports and mere technical discussions by educational experts, there are constantly appearing books of a more popular nature. Out of much talk—much of it futile, perhaps—there comes now and then a word of wisdom; and from many books one can catch the drift of educational theory and practice. It is little wonder that there is so much discussion, for the issues involved in education are vast. As Dean West says, the subject of American collegiate education is one "which will not only bear discussion, but plainly is one which has got to be discussed"—"so serious, so inspiring, so necessary is the course of the American college." The most noteworthy general note that runs through recent books and articles is a reactionary spirit in the presence of certain extreme tendencies of educational progress.

America for the past generation has been seriously at work upon a great common school system, the development of the high school, and the improvement and enrichment of college and university—all of these gradually being brought into a more perfectly regulated system, a more harmonious plan. This movement has gone far enough to enable us to see certain definite results. When President Gilman retired from the presidency of Johns Hopkins University and President White from that of Cornell University, an era in the history of American universities may be said to have closed. Although President Eliot and President Angell are still engaged in active work, we may now see the results of nearly forty years of active service for their own institutions and for others. These four university presidents will always be identified in the popular mind with a great historical movement—the development of the elective system, the promotion of graduate work, the maintenance of high standards of admission and graduation, the correlation of an educational system, the larger atmos-

phere of freedom and tolerance that now prevails in American institutions. In President White's "Autobiography," in the "Launching of a University" by President Gilman, and in the reports, articles and books of President Eliot one may find an invaluable record of the marvelous achievements of the past generation.

There is a certain glow of enthusiasm in President White's account of his dreams and final achievement of establishing a great university. "At Berlin," he says, "I saw my ideal of a university not only realized, but extended and glorified—with renowned professors, with ample lecture halls, with everything possible in the way of illustrated material, with laboratories and museums, and a concourse of youth from all parts of the world. . . . Gradually I began to ask myself the question: 'Why not help the beginning of this system in the United States?'" The benefaction of Ezra Cornell gave him the opportunity he dreamed of, and his own zeal and patience in the face of great opposition are the heritage of all Americans. Dr. Gilman, who as a young man was unable to find any satisfactory graduate work in the large colleges of this country, found in the projected Johns Hopkins University a chance to realize his own ideal of a university; he gathered about him a band of scholars and students whose enthusiasm for research and study was felt throughout the country. President Angell did more than any one else, perhaps, to promote the development of the great state universities of the West. And more than any of these, President Eliot, with the resources and prestige of a great university at his command, worked out in detail the organization of Harvard, and with statesmanlike grasp of educational conditions has wielded an enormous influence throughout the country. Of his life and work no finer study has been made than that by President Hyde in his chapter on "A Great College President."*

As a result of the building up of their respective institutions and their general influence on others, there has come about a marked readjustment of our educational system. Where there was confusion, there is now order. In the establishment of the General Education Board with the vast resources at its command,

*The College Man and the College Woman. By William DeWitt Hyde. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1906.

of the Carnegie fund for the pensioning of teachers and the Carnegie fund for research, we have for the first time in America a general scheme for a national system which approximates that of Germany or France, and may at the same time avoid the too great evils of the centralization of power. The first report of the Carnegie Board prepared by President Pritchett is a worthy fruitage of the past generation's work. There is a clarifying of the atmosphere when we can agree upon the definition of a college as given in this report: "Any institution to be ranked as a college must have at least six professors giving their entire time to college and university work, a course of four full years in liberal arts and sciences, and should require for admission not less than the usual four years of academic or high school preparation or its equivalent."

And yet even in the presence of this great educational development, there are signs of a reaction against some of the extremes, there are voices of protest raised by men who speak with authority. All is not well. I have little patience with those general onslaughts on the larger educational institutions that one sometimes hears from ignorant and bigoted men. I do not refer to the criticism of the men who speak altogether from the outside, but rather those who speak from the inside. Even the four distinguished educators whom I have already alluded to have expressed their distrust of certain tendencies in institutions over which they have presided—tendencies that may be said to be the logical development of reforms instituted by them. Says President White: "In swinging away from the old cast iron course of instruction, and from the text-book recitation of the mere dry bones of literature, there may be seen at this hour some tendency to excessive reaction. . . . Reflecting upon the shortness of human life and the vast mass of really great literature, I see with regret courses offered dealing with the bubbles floating on the surface of literature."

Younger men have written with insight and effect of the evils of the elective system to which President White refers. Dean Briggs, the man most thoroughly conversant with undergraduate life at Harvard, wrote several years ago a most suggestive article on "Some Old-Fashioned Doubts about New-Fashioned Education." His experience and observation lead him to ask: (1) Are we sure

that we did not begin the elective system too early? (2) Are we sure that the enjoyment which we wish to put into education is sufficiently robust? (3) While fitting the study to the boy, have we been unfitting the teacher for him? (4) For the evils of the old system may we not be rushing into another servitude almost or quite as dangerous as the first?

One of the most trenchant of recent critics of the present system is Mr. Charles Francis Adams,* who, though not a professional educator, has had abundant opportunity to study educational conditions. A graduate of Harvard College under the old régime, he has been for more than a quarter of a century a member of its Board of Overseers. He gave a good description of himself as well as of a certain type of man when he said: "In no degree an admirer of things that were, I am, if possible, still less disposed to rest in all respects content with what is. My testimony is merely that of an observer,—an observer who is neither an optimist nor a pessimist,—though perhaps inclined to be otherwise-minded. I find myself as much dissatisfied with the new as I was with the old. Neither squares at all with my experience or my observation." No one ever criticised more severely the old order of things and yet he regards the elective system, which has had as its battle cry liberty, aptitude, individuality, as an educational fad, "crude, ill-considered, thoroughly unscientific, and extremely mischievous." He practically agrees with President Hadley that "the sugar plums of education do not furnish a strengthening of intellectual diet."

One of his main objections to the entire educational system is that there is a tendency for it to harden into routine and machine work. The office of president has become so absorbing on its executive side that he no longer has the direct personal influence over students that he formerly had. The college faculty tends to become a part of a complicated machine, the individuals losing their identity in a certain insistence on schedules, programmes, and curricula. The student body has become so large as to lose all personal touch with the teachers—the average undergraduate is merely "one unit in an impersonal mob." In other words, as Dean West, of Princeton, points out, education has

* Three Phi Beta Kappa Addresses. By Charles Francis Adams. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1907.

become a "business," and "universities are corporations like banks, railroads, factories, department stores." "The trustees are the proprietors, the president the manager, the professors the employees, and the students the capricious customers." To meet this condition Mr. Adams suggests a breaking up of the larger colleges into smaller colleges, very much like the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge, where there would be a smaller group of students personally supervised by a master or president or dean. Dean West tells the story of the first year of the preceptorial system at Princeton,* giving a rather optimistic account of its effect on the reading, conversation and general character of the students. The reading of this chapter causes one to think that President Wilson's scheme is the most important contribution that has been made to the problem of higher education during the past decade.

Another serious evil affecting modern scholarship is pointed out by such writers as Mr. Bliss Perry in his "Amateur Spirit," and more recently by Professor Barrett Wendell in his article on French universities in *Scribner's Magazine*. Extreme specialization has undoubtedly had its effect in narrowing the sympathies of men. Some one has said that a specialist must know more than any one else about the things that are not worth knowing. "How far can this special development, this purely professional habit of mind, proceed without injury to the symmetry of character, without impairing the varied and spontaneous and abundant play of human powers which gives joy to life?" asks Mr. Perry. And in answer he pleads for the union of the generous spirit of the amateur with the method of the professional, for "breadth of interest as well as depth of technical research." The stories of extreme specialization that have been told from time immemorial on German scholars have their parallel in many more recent American scholars whose dissertations and monographs have frequently been monuments of pedantry. It is no wonder that earnest men become impatient with scholarship when it concerns itself so often about purely technical and unessential things.

"The most ominous sign in American education today," says President Hyde, "is the fact that a certain class of institutions

* American Liberal Education. By Andrew Fleming West. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907.

are filling up their chairs with men who have indeed met the technical requirements of graduate study, men who are capped in a thesis and gowned in a doctor's degree, but who lack the grasp of their subject as a living, growing whole." To the same effect writes Dean West of unenlightened specialization: "It has now become a very fair question whether the subdivision of topics has not gone so far that not only the perception of relative values is clouded, but even the community of intellectual interest among our higher students is being destroyed. Certainly many of our scholars seem to be subjects of one or another petty principality rather than freemen in the great commonwealth of knowledge. . . . We are not objecting to specialization—far from it—but solely to the study of the unimportant. And this may take many forms. It may take the form of investigating something which, when ascertained, is found to be a trifle. Or it may take the form of solemnly proving the obvious by an elaborate array of statistics."

In a word, we have Germanized too much. Professor Wendell says: "The more I saw of them [[French universities] the more I was confirmed in my belief that American learning would be greatly strengthened if more of our graduate students came under French influence. The influence of German scholarship on America during the past ninety years has been admirable, but perhaps excessive. It has taught us a respect for fact and method which our earlier learning lacked. It has tended at the same time to encourage the notion that the object of all learning is the methodical collection of facts."

Such specialization has not only narrowed the lives of teachers, but has had a blighting influence on college students. There has developed in college communities an indifferentism, a spirit of criticism that tends to become cynicism, a contempt for anything that approaches the popular, that is baleful in its influence on younger minds. The man who cares little, who has an infinite capacity for being bored, is only too common a phenomenon. Mr. Perry's diagnosis of this disease in his chapter on "Indifferentism" should be read in every college community. It is the presence of this quality that explains academic sterility—the critic who knows literature technically, but cannot produce it; the historian who gathers facts, but cannot vitalize them, or

who "takes both sides in the same paragraph;" the philosopher who is so sympathetic with every point of view that he has no definite conclusions of his own; the teacher of the classics who emphasizes the purely technical phases of his work and never feels the glory that was Greece or the grandeur that was Rome.

It is no wonder that the genial essayist of Cambridge, Mr. Crothers, was moved, in view of his academic environment, to write a paper on the "Honorable Points of Ignorance," in which he says: "While the aggregate of intellectual wealth has increased, the individual workers are being reduced to penury. It is a pathetic illustration of 'Progress and Poverty.' Man was interested in the universe long before he began to study it scientifically. He dreamed about it, he mused over its mysteries, he talked about its more obvious aspects. And it is as interesting now as it ever was."

Mr. Perry relates the following incident: "I remember complaining, long ago, to a venerable professor, as we were talking together to morning chapel, that a required chapel service involved a costly expenditure of time, and that the German scholars were steadily drawing ahead of their American rivals because, for one reason, they saved that half hour a day. His reply was very fine; 'If you are turning a grind-stone, every moment is precious; but if you are doing a man's work the inspired moments are precious.'" This remark suggests a most serious lack in contemporary university life. While I do not believe that American universities are hot-beds of infidelity and atheism, I am thoroughly convinced that the religious atmosphere that prevails in them is not of the highest type. It is not so much an avowed opposition to religion, as an indifference to it, a tendency to agnosticism. This cannot but be a source of regret to all those who believe that the ultimate value of knowledge is, as Lord Bacon said long ago, "the glory of God and the relief of man's estate." In our emphasis on the intolerance and bigotry of the church, have we not gone to the extreme of intellectual intolerance and bigotry? Too often college professors fail to distinguish between sentiment and sentimentalism, between superstition which passes away and religion which will endure as long as the heart of man, between the form and the essence of Christianity, between Christ and his often misguided interpreters.

Now this is a source of deep regret if, as Professor James says, "it makes a tremendous emotional and practical difference to one whether we accept the universe in the drab discolored way of stoic resignation or with the passionate happiness of Christian saints. The difference is as great as that between passivity and activity, as that between the defensive and aggressive mind." I am not pleading for a mediæval ecclesiasticism. I fully accept many of the conclusions of modern science and modern criticism, but still maintain that one may do all this and still be aggressively and vitally Christian. I do not believe with the professor of philosophy at Harvard that, with the exception of Greek philosophy and Greek art, the greatest contribution to the civilization of the world is the Christian religion. I believe rather with Robert Browning that

"The acknowledgment of God in Christ
Accepted by thy reason, solves for thee
All questions in the earth and out of it."

Suppose it should turn out in the end that Browning was right and not Arnold or Huxley, that Phillips Brooks was right and not Emerson, suppose we should see that after all the attacks that have been made on the Christian church and upon the truth of revealed religion, we should find the ages rolling the other way. If in some respects our present age seems like an age of prose and reason, the next may well be an age of faith. May we not trust that the colleges will not be the last places to feel the mighty resurging of great faith and aspiration? As one reads the baccalaureate addresses of President Hadley* he feels that in their bold proclaiming of the Christian ideal to the students of Yale they are a most hopeful sign. Lacking brilliancy of thought or charm of style, they are pervaded with a spirit of genuine piety and old-fashioned morality.

*Baccalaureate Addresses. By Arthur T. Hadley. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907.

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTES

HONORE DE BALZAC. By Ferdinand Brunetière. Philadelphia and London: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1907,—316 pp.

In Brunetière's story of Balzac and his work there are, so to speak, two heroes—Brunetière and Balzac. To a student of literary criticism the interest in each is about equal. The pre-eminence of Balzac in the novel is largely paralleled by that of Brunetière in literary criticism. Just as the former applied the principle of evolution to sociology so the latter championed the evolution of literary forms. Thus the one almost anticipated Darwin and the other confirmed the theory of the mutability of species proclaimed by the English scientist. Both were close observers of men and students of ideas, both bending every effort to unite individuals into a "social solidarity."

When, however, we come to the manner or method of the novelist and the critic, then there is a parting of the ways. While Balzac, the father and master of the modern novel, is democratic in his artistic methods and selection of materials, Brunetière, the originator of evolutionary criticism in literature, is aristocratic in that he clings to the traditions and the formalism of the classic ideas. The former is a realist, or rather a naturalist, admitting all life into his sphere of artistic creation, but the latter would exclude from art certain exceptional phases of nature. The novelist, portraying contemporary manners and holding life—and not art—responsible for the vices and virtues that came within the range of his camera, fixed if he did not create the general form of the novel, just as Molière gave permanency to the typical form of comedy. Unlike Scott, who attempted—I will not say successfully—to reproduce the past, Balzac confined his scenes and characters to his own time. He was, therefore, the chronicler of modern French morals. This fidelity to life led to a certain minuteness of detail foreign to the ideals of the critic of self-restraint and universal ideas. The one who particularized or realized life in its totality was naturally opposed by the scholastic who would eliminate the non-essentials. The naturalistic novelist was more in accord with his own con-

temporary Sainte-Beuve, who insisted on filling his critical pages with biographical minutiae or "small-talk."

In the preface to his unconventional study of Balzac, Brunetière warns us that his appreciation is not devoted to such biographical gossip. He forthwith displays his fine historical sense in a chapter on the modern novel before Balzac, in which he discusses the "personal novel" and the "historical novel." The "personal novel" descended from the Spanish "picaresque novel," treats of particular and extraordinary adventures, and cannot increase our knowledge of common life. From "Gil Blas," which conforms more than the "picaresque novel" to the correct idea of a novel, sprang the personal narratives of "Robinson Crusoe" and "Manon Lescaut," in which there is a perceptible advance towards the realistic novel of Balzac. After the "psychological novel in letters" comes the "historical novel" of which Scott was the most conspicuous writer.

Passing over the chapter on Balzac's years of apprenticeship, with its interesting remarks on his knowledge of law, his irregular life, his genius, and the impossibility of separating his art from his life, we come to Balzac's great monument entitled "The Human Comedy." While the chronological sequence of one's work is of importance in personal or subjective literature, it is of little consequence in impersonal or objective literature. Balzac does not select his subjects, but the subjects take possession of him. Each of his works, furthermore, cannot be understood by itself, but only in relation to the whole series of novels embraced under the comprehensive title of "The Human Comedy." This title is not borrowed from Dante's "Divine Comedy;" it is the comedy which humanity plays for itself.

The genius and the equipment of the critic are seen in the chapters on the historical significance, the æsthetic value, the social bearing, and the morality of Balzac's novels, authentic documents in contemporary manners, a kind of memoirs of society. Though not historical novels, they have a historical significance in that they fulfil the proper definition of the novel, the essential merit of a novel being its resemblance to life. In addition to style a great novelist must possess such literary qualities as strength of conception, the gift of constructing a plot, the faculty of arriving at the truth, and the art of pathos. Balzac was rather indifferent

to romanticism, being more interested in the representation of life than in the realization of beauty. In the æsthetic sense of the word he is a naturalist, considering as necessary the exact imitation of nature in all things. At times Balzac carries to excess the accessories of archæology, decoration, costume, and local color, reminding one of George Sand's science and Hugo's erudition. He emphasizes unduly physiological and pathological documents, his treatment of diseases and singularities recalling Ibsen. He studies social species, all the individuals of which exist only in the classes to which they belong. Love, marriage, money, religion, and morality are to him subjects of artistic interest. Balzac's novels, representing the whole of life and therefore not allowing their author to choose or limit as Brunetière would do, are neither moral nor immoral. Balzac cannot, then, be immoral in being exact, but only in misrepresenting life or in the conception of his art.

The two closing chapters of Brunetière's sane and well-proportioned study of the great novelist are devoted to Balzac's influence and place in literature. His influence upon the stage is seen in his forcing upon many of the dramatists a more exact imitation of life. Soon, too, the Balzacian conception of the novel began to prevail over other conceptions, influencing Sand, Feuillet, and Dickens. From now on the form of the novel will be the Balzacian, and its proper object will be the representation of reality. While his work is singularly unequal and disproportionate, and shows the defects of improvisation, lack of style, and the violation of the rules of grammar, and while he does not occupy the first rank as a writer, yet as a novelist no greater has been known in European literature.

JAMES D. BRUNER.

THE MECKLENBURG DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE. By William Henry Hoyt, A. M. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1907, —vii., 284 pp.

This book deserves a most worthy place in the literature of North Carolina history. Its subject has been the source of controversy and investigation for many years. Did the citizens of Mecklenburg County on May 20, 1775, adopt resolutions declaring themselves "a free and independent people—under the control

of no power other than that of our God and the General Government of Congress?" Or, were the resolves of May 31, 1775, which declared the British government suspended and provided for the administration of government until the colonies and the crown should be reconciled, the only action resembling revolution taken by the citizens of Mecklenburg at that time? Mr. Hoyt undertook his investigation believing in the resolves of May 20, but after reviewing the evidence of other writers and making researches of his own, he has concluded that the only resolves ever adopted were those of May 31, that these were transfigured by the imperfect understanding and recollection of many persons into a declaration of independence, and that all copies can be traced to a common source—rough notes made from memory in 1800 after the original records of the meeting in May, 1775, had been destroyed by fire.

In reaching this conclusion Mr. Hoyt has shown himself a master of many arts essential to historical investigation. Textual criticism, literary comparison, an instinct for lost trails of evidence, an understanding and portrayal of the spirit of the past, above all sanity and good judgment—these qualities place the book among the very best of the excellent contributions to the history of North Carolina that have been made within the past few years. A sense of its value and character may best be conveyed by examining the treatment of two essential questions, the sources of the resolves of May 20 and the contemporary evidence.

Dr. Alexander Graham, in his "Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence," the latest defense, emphasizes the trustworthiness of Martin's "History of North Carolina" and Garden's "Anecdotes of the Revolution." But Mr. Hoyt shows that Martin "copied into his work" an account of the Mecklenburg Declaration published by Judge Murphy in the *Hillsboro Recorder* in 1821, which was based on notes furnished by Colonel William Polk, and that Polk's text of the Resolves of May 20 was taken from a manuscript copy in possession of Dr. Joseph McKnitt Alexander; even Polk acknowledged that he could not vouch for them being in the words of the Committee who framed them. Likewise Garden's account is taken in part *verbatim et literatim* from Murphy's article and another account written in 1828 for the *Charleston Mercury*. Thus the copies of the May 20 resolves given by these authors, as well as the Davie copy, trace their

origin to the notes and the manuscript made by Joseph McKnitt Alexander from memory after the records were destroyed in 1800.

The examination of contemporary evidence also reveals very little to support the claims for the resolves of May 20. The famous lines of poetry by Mecklenburg Censor which indicate a "withdrawal from British trust" did not belong to the original poem, but were fraudently added by some early advocate of the authenticity of the Mecklenburg Declaration; the deeds which seem to be dated from 1775 as the year of independence are shown to be unreliable evidence; even the reference to independence in Traugott Bagge's diary is not indisputably to the resolves of May 20. Finally, the lost *Cape Fear Mercury* argument is well disposed of, for among the papers of Lord Dartmouth a manuscript copy of the May 31 resolves has been found whose original was sent to England by Governor Martin in June, 1775; why, therefore, suppose that the Governor's description of political activity in Mecklenburg, sent to England at the same time, refers to any other meeting and resolves than those of May 31? Such a view is charitable as well as sane, for thereby Mr. Jefferson is cleared from all charge of plagiarism and his friends from removing evidences of his guilt from the Public Record Office.

These are by no means the only cogent criticisms of Mr. Hoyt. The spirit of the May 20 resolves is shown to be contrary to the spirit and the activity of the time in North Carolina and elsewhere. But the book has constructive value. It is quite clear that political opinion in North Carolina was well advanced and that the May 31 resolves seemed to the members of the Continental Congress and to others too radical. Even intelligent writers like Bancroft and Lossing looked upon the resolves of May 31 as creating actual independence. Is it strange, therefore, that something of the same interpretation of events of May, 1775, became a tradition in Mecklenburg County, especially since no copy of the May 31 resolves was published until 1838 and John McKnitt Alexander, writing from memory, might confuse old style and new style of reckoning dates and write May 20 for May 31?

Such are the conclusions of Mr. Hoyt and unless new evidence of great weight and new character is discovered, his interpretation of the Mecklenburg Declaration will remain the one generally accepted, and in time will be accepted by all. WM. K. BOYD.

THE AMERICAN SCENE. By Henry James. New York and London: Harper & Brothers, 1907,—443 pp.

Mr. Henry James, who, after an absence of nearly twenty-five years, returned to this country for a visit of several months, has in this volume given his impressions of his native land. As a young man he went to live in Europe to enjoy the impressions, more numerous and various and of a higher intensity than those to be gathered here. Having lived for long years "in the very precincts of the temple" of art and beauty, he sought romance and mystery in the native, the forsaken scene, "now passing, as continual rumor had it, through a thousand stages and changes." America would now be romantic, because she was different from Europe. He writes not so much of the human life he met with—suggesting that he may do so in another volume—as of the external characteristics of New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Newport, Concord and Salem, Washington, Baltimore, Richmond, Charleston and Florida. The point of view is that of the "restless analyst," the "expatriated observer," charmed with the signs of the antique and the picturesque, rather than with the more obvious aspects of our commercial and democratic life. Mr. James is frankly out of sympathy with "the eternal American note."

In Boston he is struck with the overwhelming number of aliens that have destroyed the homogeneity of the old population with which he was familiar as a boy, and he has but little sympathy with the new Boston of Commonwealth and Marlborough avenues as contrasted with the crooked streets and picturesque sidewalks of the old Boston. The Public Library in no sense takes the place of the old Athenæum. The ampler resources and buildings of Harvard and the elaborate system of parks along the Charles look but mean and vulgar by the Harvard and Cambridge of Lowell, Longfellow and Howells. Concord alone keeps the look, the feeling, the air of the olden time. With infinite relief the author passes from New York or Newport to the Hudson of Washington Irving, or to Philadelphia and Baltimore.

To a Southerner the chapters on Richmond and Charleston are especially suggestive and interesting, if, indeed, they are not the best chapters in the book. Mr. James came South with every desire to be "romantically affected"—here he would find in abundance the survivals of "old unhappy far off things." Unable to

understand or to see with the eye of imagination the forces that are making the new order, he hoped to feel in the most poignant manner the beauty and tragedy of the old order. In Richmond he found only a void, a blank—not only no survivals, but no worthy record in any form of art. In Charleston, with the author of "Lady Baltimore" as his guide, he was satisfied as perhaps nowhere else in the country save Concord. St. Michael's church and the old cemetery raised him to "the highest Carolinian pitch."

Mr. James' style, like his thought, is baffling. The mingling of cold analysis with a dreamy sentimentalism is an unusual phenomenon in writing. His criticism is extremely disinterested rather than wisely sympathetic, but for that reason the book should be read by intelligent Americans. There is no use getting mad at what he says—better be sure that he is not right. E. M.

SIDNEY LANIER. By Henry Nelson Snyder. New York: Eaton & Mains, 1907,—132 pp.

President Snyder, of Wofford College, has made in this volume a sympathetic and vital interpretation of Lanier as a man and as a poet. It is not a biography, though the first chapter is probably the best short sketch of Lanier's life that has been written. It is not a study of his poetry from a critical and technical standpoint—there is no attempt to "place" him in American or English literature, or to weigh his defects and virtues with those of other poets. It is rather a setting forth of Lanier's religious ideas as expressed in his character and in his writings. Lanier's conception of the mission of poetry—"he was devoutly religious in the thought of his own genius and what it brought to him"—his love of nature as a revelation of God, his relation to the main tendencies of his age, his conception of the world as "a God-informed, a God-directed world," his gospel of love as the solution of all life's mysterious problems, and finally his conception of Christ as the supreme revelation of God's love to the world—all these are treated by Dr. Snyder in a luminous and felicitous way. In every chapter there is evidence that the author is a scholar who is most of all concerned with the spiritual values of poetry.

The book is exceedingly well written. Where there is so much

that is quotable it is difficult to select passages, but there are many sentences like the following: "No mail-clad warrior out of the fields of old romance ever quested for fairer adventures than did this knight of our new days." "Gladly and unreservedly, with a kind of prophetic wisdom, he received with open arms the new and stronger country rising out of the twilight gloom of war." "He saw the Sangreal shining in the murk and gloom of things, and this insight gave him strength and leading." "The great currents of the thought of the century beat in upon his mind and heart." "From the light of the personality of the Christ gleams the radiance that has shone in the singularly beautiful character of the man and the utter spirituality of his message." To all admirers of Lanier—and their number is constantly increasing—this volume will be very acceptable by reason of the complete interpretation of the poet's "message," and to many who have not known him it will serve as an introduction to the "Sir Galahad of American Letters."

E. M.

THE CENSORSHIP OF THE CHURCH OF ROME AND ITS INFLUENCE UPON THE PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION OF LITERATURE. By George Haven Putnam, Litt. D., 2 vols. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1906,—xxv., 315 pp., 510 pp.

Latter day historians are devoting more attention, each year, to the intellectual development of modern Europe. Though knowledge of our intellectual antecedents will never, perhaps, be so complete as that of institutional origins, the appreciation of the subject grows steadily and in years to come acquaintance with John of Salisbury, Thomas Aquinas, Petrarch, and Voltaire will have as large a place in general knowledge as Magna Carta, the Bill of Rights, or the German Constitution.

The question of ecclesiastical censorship, however, needs no revolution in historical tastes to make it attractive; its association with political liberty and its appeal to the deepest sympathies of human nature give it a lasting interest. Mr. Putnam's contribution is useful, but it can hardly be pronounced a success or of permanent value. The reason is apparent, for the author devotes most of his space to a description of the various prohibitions and indexes issued by ecclesiastical and state authorities and a summary of some of the censured books, while the broader

philosophical aspects of the subject, such as the influence of censorship on book production, the literary policy of the modern church, and the extent of its authority over the intellect receive only three chapters. The value of the book is therefore as a work of reference for those who have not access to or cannot handle the language of Reusch's "Index der Verbotenen Bücher." All criticism, however, should take into account that the problems of intellectual history are most exacting, they seem to be too vast and delicate for the mind and the literary power of all except the most gifted, and the time has not yet come, perhaps never will come, for any other treatment of ecclesiastical censorship than that given by Mr. Putnam.

WM. K. BOYD.

NEWER IDEALS OF PEACE. By Jane Addams. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1907,—xviii., 243 pp.

This valuable volume in the Citizen's Library of Economics, Politics, and Sociology is full of the fruits of an expert study of social conditions in the industrial quarter of a cosmopolitan city. It is concerned with the gradual development of the moral substitutes for war. It looks forward to a time when militarism will be abandoned and society will be "controlled by recognized ideals of social justice."

Miss Addams shows the line of development which the new ideals must take in the many social interests of our crowded centers of population. There are shown to be certain survivals of militarism in city government which must gradually disappear as we attain the ideals of an evolutionary democracy. In the matter of the relations between capital and labor, the war element is an essential part of the strike. Democracy is forced to give attention to industrial conditions with a view to removing causes of friction and securing justice. Thus society will develop toward industrial peace. Miss Addams finds many other survivals of militarism in our social organization, and points the way in which the "newer ideals of peace may be developed." G.

